

THE DACCA UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Vol. I

November, 1935

No. I



**PUBLISHED
FOR THE
UNIVERSITY OF DACCA**

**BY
BRINDABON DHAR AND SONS LTD.**

Proprietors : Asutosh Library

**Patuatuly,
Dacca**

**5 College Square
Calcutta**

BENGAL, INDIA.

THE DACCA UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Vol. I

NOVEMBER, 1935.

No. I



November, 1935.

Price Rs. 1/8 per copy

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Maeterlinck's Dramatic Method

J. N. Chaudhuri 1

Modern Problem Plays

P. K. Guha 17

On the Transfer of the Capital of Mughal Bengal from Raj Mahal to Dacca (Jahangirnagar) By Islam Khan Chishti

Dr. S. N. Bhattacharyya, M. A., Ph. D. ... 36

The Date of the Khadga Dynasty

Pramode Lal Paul, M.A. 64

The Death of Himū

Sukumar Ray, M. A. 67

An old-Javanese Inscription of the Saka year 841

Himansu Bhusan Sarkar, M.A. 102

Some Side-Lights on the Nuşairis

Sirajul Haqq, M.A. 132

An Account of the Immigration of Persian Poets into Bengal

Dr. M. I. Borrah, M.A., Ph.D. 141

Jagannātha's Treatment of the Guṇa-Concept in Sanskrit Poetics

Prakas Chandra Lahiri, Kavyatirtha, M.A. ... 151

On the Constitution of Lignin

Pulin Behari Sarkar 172

EDITORIAL NOTES

... .. 189

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

... .. 190

THE DACCA UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Vol. I

NOVEMBER, 1935.

No. I

MAETERLINCK'S DRAMATIC METHOD

J. N. CHAUDHURI,

Lecturer in English, Class I.

The cult of dramatic naturalism which manifested itself in the seventies of the last century in some of the social plays of Björnson and which became triumphant in the eighties in those of Ibsen and Strindberg, continued with unabated strength for about four decades till the outbreak of the War. Even during the War and after, it did not completely cease to function, so that for nearly half a century it had great exponents both on the Continent and in England; and, if one considers how effectively it tackled the problems of social and individual life during this period, one may even look forward to a renewed vogue of the cult when post-war experimentation in such fields as politics and war-experiences has had its day. But whatever glory naturalism may have achieved in the past or may still achieve in the future, idealism or the spirit of romance is never to be killed. It makes itself felt in unexpected quarters, slackening the rigour of scientific observation with the touch of mystery. Sometimes the same author who usually revels in intellectual analysis of the life of society and the individual is found yielding to the imaginative vision; sometimes a mystic

idealist weaves his dreams side by side with a hard realist who cares for nothing beyond what he sees. The creator of *A Doll's House* and *Ghosts* also created *Rosmersholm* and *The Master-Builder* : naturalistic dissection and exposition made room for suggestion through symbolism. Similarly, the savage realist of *The Father* and *The Dance of Death* turned into an almost unintelligible mystic in *The Spook Sonata* and *The Dream Play*. Uncompromising naturalism (as in *Before Dawn*, *The Weavers*, *The Beaver Coat*, *The Conflagration*), dream-symbolism (as in *Hannele*) and spiritual allegory (as in *The Sunken Bell*) emanated from Hauptmann's pen within a few years of each other. While Shaw in England and Brieux in France searched out social foibles with the glare of their intellect, Celtic twilight cast its gloom over Yeats's *Deirdre* and *Cathleen ni Houlihan* and Synge's *Riders to the Sea* ; and simultaneously with some of Ibsen's and Strindberg's greatest triumphs in naturalism, Villiers de L'Isle-Adam spurned at social life and evoked the romance of mediæval castle and convent to preach that the ideal is the real (1). Maeterlinck turned his romantic vision to the mysteries of subconscious life about the year 1889 (the year of Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler*, Strindberg's *Creditors*, and Hauptmann's *Before Dawn*), and carried on his mystic work through the heyday of naturalism into the twenties of the present century.

The romanticism of Maeterlinck's dramas has a close affinity with that of Villiers's *Axël* : it is a kind of spiritual romanticism springing from an atmosphere of isolation from the matter-of-fact world and a spiritual ferment in the *dramatis personæ*. This isolation and this ferment, again, are a direct consequence of Maeterlinck's aim in dramatic creation, *viz.*, to show 'some act of life, traced back to its sources and to its mystery by connecting links' (2). His conviction is that life in modern times reveals its truth not through violence and noise but through peace and silence. The ferment that takes place within the soul of his characters is not without the element of conflict,—conflict between love and friendship, as in *Selysette* and

1. According to Dr. D. Knowles, the first part of *Axël* was published in 1872 and the entire drama in 1885 ; but according to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (14th edition) the date of publication of the entire drama is 1890, the year after Villiers's death.

2. *The Treasure of the Humble*, P. 104.

Tatiana ; between love and religion, as in Sister Beatrice ; between chastity and religion, as in Mary Magdalene ; between chastity and love, as in Joyzelle ; between duty to self and duty to the state, as in Monna Vanna ; but these conflicts very rarely lead to any external bitterness ; there is never any thought of revenge ; the aggrieved party pardons and becomes reconciled to fate or retires from the field to court self-immolation ; and despite these conflicts there is as much calm and silence in the world of his *dramatis personæ* as it is possible to have on the stage. Some might even hold that there is more calm and silence on Maeterlinck's stage than is compatible with the vitality of the drama and that his theory of a 'static theatre' is nothing but a piece of heresy. It might be noted here that though some of his characteristic but earlier plays are plays almost without any movement, he does not speak of a literally static theatre. He very cautiously says, "I do not know whether it be true that a static theatre is impossible. Indeed, to me it seems to exist already" (3). What he means is that in such masterpieces of classical drama as *Prometheus*, *Suppliants*, *Choephora*, *The Eumenides*, *Antigone*, *Electra*, *Oedipus at Colonus*, *Ajax*, and *Philoctetes*, physical or material action has been reduced almost to a nullity, and in most of them even psychological action 'has been suppressed, or at least vastly diminished, in a truly marvellous fashion, with the result that the interest centres solely and entirely in the individual, face to face with the universe' (4). One need not have much difficulty in accepting the first half of his position, that life presented in these masterpieces is almost motionless ; but it is hard to agree with him when he says that even psychological action, in most of them, has been suppressed or vastly diminished. He has taken care to exclude the dramas of Euripides where passions have a free play ; but even the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles which he has mentioned are generally full of tumultuous passions. Prometheus himself is calm amidst his afflictions, but the daughters of Ocean who bemoan his fate shed bitter tears, and Io, in the 'agony of frenzied brain' (5), craves for death rather than suffer misery through all her days. Softness of

3. *The Treasure of the Humble*, pp. 106, 107. 4. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

5. A. S. Way's translation in *Aeschylus in English Verse*, Part II (1907).

feeling would be incompatible with Prometheus's adamant resolve to suffer and not to yield, but the wailings of the Oceanides and the agonies of Io create a fine passionate contrast with the hero's invincible calm. In *Choephoraë* Electra's and Orestes's prayers for vengeance, appealing to Earth and Zeus and the spirit of their deceased father, are charged with deep feelings while, after the murder of the mother, Orestes becomes like one 'whose horses whirl his car without the course, swept helpless in the tumult of his brain' (6). In *Eumenides*, the sole business of the characters being a dispensation of justice, there is little room for outburst of passion, but still the ghost of Clytemnestra exhibits a remorse and anger that kindle wrath in the fatal sisters. Antigone's lamentations as she is dragged along to the fateful cavern are the most touching thing in the drama named after her. Anguish, grief and joy are shown following one another in rapid succession in *Electra*. The crisis in the life of Oedipus Tyrannus is reached amidst frenzied passion and, after the crisis, the profound anguish of soul of the hapless king comes out in a hundred exclamations. At Colonos, Oedipus's indignation is as vehement as Antigone's sorrow is deep. The entire background of *Ajax* is one of mad fury, the drama itself, as Maeterlinck himself acknowledges, dealing with nothing but the hero's regret for that fury. And lastly, the depths of Philoctetes' soul, so far as they are revealed, are revealed in his indignation and sorrow. Of all the classical plays that Maeterlinck has cited to support his position, perhaps *Suppliants* is the poorest in passion; but even that play is not completely free from it. The daughters of Danaus, on the point of being overtaken by their pursuers, 'fettered as one in a nightmare' (7) shriek, cursing and praying in the same breath. Indeed, it is difficult to conceive how a drama would be possible without both physical and psychological action. Maeterlinck describes psychological action as one 'that seems indispensable' ('qui semble indispensable') (8); we would call it 'indispensable' without any reservation. Sounding the depths of the human soul has always been the noblest

6. Prof. G. C. W. Warr's translation in *The Athenian Drama*, Vol I (1900), p. 80.

7. A. S. Way's translation in *Aeschylus in English Verse*, Part II (1907), p. 96.

8. *Le Trésor des Humbles* (1904), p. 190.

part of the function of drama. That function itself is largely psychological in character. Examining *Philoctetes* in some detail, Maeterlinck holds that 'the chief interest of the tragedy does not lie in the struggle we witness between cunning and loyalty, between love of country, rancour, and headstrong pride. There is more beyond : for it is man's loftier existence that is laid bare to us' (9). It is beyond doubt that man's loftier existence is laid bare to us in *Philoctetes* more than in Neoptolemus or Ulysses. But how is this existence revealed? *Philoctetes* *does* absolutely nothing ; he only *feels*, and expresses those feelings in words, as far as feelings may be thus expressed ; there is not much even of thinking. Maeterlinck rather mystically says that a poet adds to ordinary life an unknown something, which is the poet's secret, and thereby reveals life in its stupendous grandeur, even as a chemist adds a few mysterious drops to a vessel of pure water and thereby raises masses of crystals to the surface. The feelings of *Philoctetes* undoubtedly suggest an inexpressible tumult that passes within the depths of his being, but these feelings are the crystals that may be detected rising to the surface of life. Maeterlinck describes *King Lear* as 'the mightiest, the vastest, the most stirring, the most intense dramatic poem that has ever been written' (10), 'the synthetic and representative play, the archetypal play of the human stage' (10). And yet in this play what crystals has Shakspeare brought to the surface, except the crystals of passion? In this play, says Maeterlinck, "fatality itself is quite inward, is no more than passion run mad" (11) ; the summit on which the play unfolds itself "is formed solely of enormous human strata, of gigantic blocks of passion, of reason, of general and almost familiar sentiments, overthrown, heaped up, superimposed by an awful tempest" (12) ; "the lyricism of the play is more continuous, more overflowing and more illusive and yet more natural, nearer to the realities of everyday life, more familiarly stirring than the lyricism of *Hamlet*, because it springs not from thought, but from passion" (13). Crystals of thoughts also may come up to the surface as they do in *Hamlet* and,

9. *The Treasure of the Humble*, pp. 109, 110.

10. *Life and Flowers*, p. 192.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 196, 197.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 196.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 195.

sometimes, in *Macbeth* ; but when life passes through an intensely critical moment, thoughts almost merge into feelings. The classical masterpieces in which Maeterlinck holds that even psychological action has been suppressed are rich in passion, certainly richer in passion than in thought. It would not have mattered if they were richer in thought than in passion. Psychological action would have been there, as in fact it is already there in plenty. Maeterlinck's phrase 'psychological action', therefore, seems rather obscure. Can he mean by it only the action that consists in the processes of 'elementary passions' like vengeance and lust ? With reference to these masterpieces he says : "Here we are no longer with the barbarians, nor is man now fretting himself in the midst of elementary passions, as though, forsooth, these were the only things worthy of note : he is at rest, and we have time to observe him" (14). Orestes and Electra are not barbarians, nor are Aegisthus and Clytemnestra ; but, all the same, they are victims of the passions of vengeance and lust. Maeterlinck has gone too far in asserting that even psychological action has been suppressed in these classical plays. Deprived of physical action, the dramatist is left only with psychological action wherethrough to present and interpret life. This is the action that the classical tragedians predominantly used and this is the action that Maeterlinck himself has predominantly used in most of his plays to reveal the spiritual ferment in his *dramatis personæ* of which we have spoken above.

Physical action, in some of Maeterlinck's plays, is even less than that in many classical tragedies ; in others it is perhaps as much or a little more. *The Intruder*, for example, presents a stage whose static condition is unrivalled even by the stage of *Philoctetes* or *Prometheus Bound*. Like all tragedians he has not been able to avoid death ; but if his imitations of Elizabethan drama and the two realistic dramas of the War are left out, death never enters his plays amidst blood and thunder. It enters with the cry of a child, the rustle of a wind, a flicker of the lamp, a tap on the door, amidst avowal of love and confession of sin. Its approaching form is occasionally veiled by the beauty of the night, occasionally by the beauty of passing flocks and singing birds and opening flowers.

Bodily movements that may be found indispensable are sometimes enchanted by the creation of a dream-world. Physical action being thus virtually banished or reduced to a position of only minor importance, the characters express themselves mostly through dialogues and sometimes even through silence. As a means of communication between soul and soul, silence occupies a very peculiar position in Maeterlinck's philosophy and dramatic art. "Speech", according to him, "is of Time, Silence is of Eternity" (15). "The true life, the only life that leaves a trace behind, is made of silence alone" (16). Silence is "the angel of the supreme truth, the messenger that brings to the heart the tidings of the unknown" (17). "It is the sun of love, and it ripens the fruit of the soul, as the sun of heaven ripens the fruit of the earth" (18). His characters are never eloquent; they never deliver oratorical speeches. As in normal life we rarely utter a dozen sentences without a pause or two, so too his characters never speak a dozen sentences at a stretch: pauses, however slight, occur at intervals. From *Princess Maleine* to *The Power of the Dead*, the pages of his dramas are bestrewn with dots and dashes, expressive of the natural breaths his characters take while talking. Similarly, silence, as a dramatic device, is used in the majority of his plays, though with far less frequency in the later than in the earlier ones. Always longer than a mere pause, it varies in duration and serves to help on in different ways the development of atmosphere and character and consequently of plot. In the half-dozen early plays which are of a decidedly static character, namely, *The Intruder*, *The Slightless*, *The Seven Princesses*, *Alladine and Palomides*, *Interior*, and *The Death of Tintagiles*, and also in *Pelleas and Melisanda* and *Aglavaine and Selysette*, it has sometimes been used to suggest sullen reproof, gloomy discontent, languor, helpless resignation to fate, the coming on of an unknown calamity, anxious waiting, an inexplicable uneasiness of heart, the presence of a mystery, and terror; sometimes it suggests the birth of jealousy and hatred and sometimes the birth of love. Among the later plays, a brief silence in *Monna Vanna* seems to betoken a tumult within the depths

15. *The Treasure of the Humble*, p. 4.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 15.

of the soul at a critical moment in the lives of the central figures, and in *Mary Magdalene* a profound silence reveals a deep spiritual crisis in the life of the heroine. In *Joyxelle* and *The Cloud that Lifted* silence has no new function but indicates the operation of love and hatred as in some of the earlier plays. It is not possible to define exactly the significance of silence in any situation that is psychologically important; but still, silence is found to be the only means of intercourse between one soul and another at the most critical moments of their existence. When the atmosphere is charged with the presence of dark, inscrutable forces of destiny, and the soul stands face to face with the mysterious unknown, speech automatically fails; the soul scarcely knows its own upheavals below the surface of consciousness. Even the commoner forces of love, jealousy and hatred bring about repercussions that may leave no external trace except in a look of the eye. Not only this; apart from the significance that silence may have in itself, it adds to the weight of the words actually uttered. Silence creates an atmosphere in which words put on a new colouring. Accordingly, the real value of words may be appraised only if they are taken along with the silence that accompanies them. "As gold and silver are weighed in pure water, so does the soul test its weight in silence, and the words that we let fall have no meaning apart from the silence that wraps them round" (19).

The extraordinary emphasis that Maeterlinck lays on the value of silence has led him to divide dialogues under two categories, 'outer' and 'inner' or dialogues of the 'first degree' and dialogues of the 'second degree' (20). He holds that the dialogues that fill the pages of an ordinary drama generally touch the mere surface of life; in a drama that is really beautiful and great such superficial dialogues, if any, count for little, as an 'atmosphere of the soul' (21) is produced there by words which at first sight appear unnecessary, but which at bottom are the whisperings through which the soul will reveal itself in the presence of a mystery. They are akin to silence and assist silence in the establishment of a spiritual communion between characters on whom the language of ordinary

19. The Treasure of the Humble, p. 19.

20. Ibid., pp. 115, 119.

21. Ibid., p. 116.

conversation falls flat. Maeterlinck detects an extremely attenuated and variable echo of this type of spiritual dialogue in some of the tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles and in modern times, for example, in Ibsen's *Master-Builder*. Hilda and Solness, in his opinion, are the first characters who feel themselves living for an instant in an atmosphere of the soul, and their conversation resembles nothing we have ever heard. The two types of dialogues, he tells us, are found in great dramas side by side; but with reference to the conversation of Hilda and Solness he says that there the inner and the outer dialogue have been blended in one expression. The point is very subtle and may be regarded as constituting a kind of esoterism in dramatic art. None should be so rash as to dogmatise on the character of a particular dialogue, whether it is purely an 'inner' dialogue or 'outer' or a blending of the two; but one might be pardoned an attempt to find out an instance or two of such a blending from Maeterlinck's own dramas. As silence plays a more prominent part in the earlier 'static' plays, this blending of inner and outer dialogues also seems to be more in evidence in them. Much of the conversation between the Grandfather and the other characters in *The Intruder* may illustrate it. In *Alladine and Palomides* the conversation (Act V) carried on in subdued tones by Alladine, Palomides, Astolaine and the Sisters of Palomides seems to suggest something over and above the meaning of the actual words. Outside the static plays, Vanna's talk with Prinzivalle in *Monna Vanna* (Act II, Sc. iii) does not spring merely from the intellect and reason; and in *Mary Magdalene* the words coming out of the mouths of Mary and Lazarus (Act II, Sc. iii) have perhaps a significance of the 'second degree.'

The predominance of psychological action and the exclusion of oratory have jointly imparted a lyrical tone to the majority of Maeterlinck's plays. The plays beginning with *The Intruder* and ending with *Ardiane and Barbe Bleue* are steeped in lyricism. In the remaining plays, from *Monna Vanna* to *The Power of the Dead*, the characters reveal themselves through narration or description rather than through emotional outbursts, but occasional lyric passages are not rare in some of them. Of the earlier plays which are throughout lyrical in tone, it may be generally said that the characters therein are essentially subjective in temperament, each of them having

a world of his or her own. They have little to do with the world of humanity at large, with its ceaseless toil and trouble. Far from the madding crowd of the matter-of-fact world, they face their destinies in silence. Their passions flow on smoothly and calmly, never rising to the tumultuous glow of classical or the feverous heat of Elizabethan tragedies. Accordingly, the lyrical note of these plays is akin to the soft piping of a shepherd ; it never attains the symphonic grandeur of a classical chorus or the pitch and volume of a Macbeth's anguished cry. The emotional fervour of the characters sometimes finds expression in songs which have a mystic, haunting appeal. These songs do not seem to have any direct connection with the action of the plays ; but they beautifully suggest the emotional condition of the persons who sing them, almost as an echo suggests the character of a far-off sound. King Ablamore sings of unhappiness that had three keys of gold ; Melisanda sings (22) of a thirty years' fruitless search for the object of the heart's desire ; in Selysette's song of the lover the door is heard to close, the lamp to burn, and the soul to moan ; and a fairy dies in the song of Orlamonde's five daughters sung by the imprisoned wives of Blue Beard. What were those three keys of old ? Who was the sad lady addressing her sisters after a fruitless search for thirty years ? Who heard the door close, the lamp burn, and the soul moan ? And who was the fairy that died and why should a fairy die ? None can give a definite reply to any one of these questions. The songs are vague and suggest old, bygone days of sadness and magic ; but the impressions they leave on the mind very faithfully indicate the peculiar moods of the singers. The songs, however, do not exhaust the lyricism of the plays. The emotional nature of the *dramatis personæ* often tends to invest even the prose they talk with a rhythm, not unlike the rhythm of free verse. The exact character of this rhythm can hardly be clear to the uncertain ear of a foreigner, but an attempt may be made to find out some of the conditions that have combined to produce the result. The first thing that attracts one's notice in this connection is the brevity of the sentences spoken. Generally they do not

22. The song in the English translation of the play, 'Thirty years I've sought, my sisters', suits the context better than the song in the original, 'Les trois soeurs aveugles'.

require more breath for the utterance than does an English verse of eight, ten or, at most, twelve syllables. Next, these brief sentences are sometimes divided into two parts at the middle and sometimes into three parts at approximately equal intervals (23). Thus the following lines from the beginning of *The Intruder* are divided into two halves by a distinct pause at the middle :

Venez ici, grand-père, asseyez-vous sous la lampe.

Allons-nous sur la terrasse, ou restons-nous dans cette
chambre ? (24)

So also the following from *The Seven Princesses* :

Je ne la vois pas bien : il y a une ombre sur elle...

Oui ; il y a une ombre sur elle ; je ne sais ce que c'est...(25)

The following sentences from *Alladine and Palomides* seem to break up each into three approximately equal parts :

Il y eut des soirs où je vous quittais sans rien dire,
et où j'allais pleurer d'admiration dans un coin du palais,
parceque vous aviez simplement levé les yeux,
fait un petit geste inconscient ou souri sans raison apparente, (26)

In the third place, silence and pause, taken with a smaller number of syllables, often produce the harmony of symmetrical expressions, as in the following from *The Death of Tintagiles* :

Mais tu ne me comprends pas !...Soeur Ygraine !...Il n'y a pas
de temps !...Elle n'a pas pu me retenir...Je l'ai frappée,
frappée...J'ai couru...Vite, vite, elle arrive !.....(27)

23. With reference to the prose of the first eight or nine plays it has been said, 'Les rythmes s'adaptent à chaque instant à la mesure de l'octosyllabe et de l'alexandrin classique, ou plutôt des douze temps et des divisions en six, quatre et trois temps que ces vers étaient sensés grouper et redoubler. Le seule différence qui sépare cette prose du "vers libre" est dans le manque d'intention.' *La Poesie Populaire et le Lyrisme Sentimental* by Robert de Souza (1899), p. 131.

24. *L'Intruse* (1892), p. 11.

25. *Les Sept Princesses* (1891), pp. 22, 23.

26. *Alladine et Palomides* (1894), p. 38.

27. *La Mort de Tintagiles* (1894), p. 187.

Lastly, a very noticeable feature of these lyrical expressions is repetition,—repetition of single words, phrases, and sometimes even of short sentences. This is illustrated in the second and the fourth extract given here. Illustrations might be multiplied from some of the later plays as well.

The subsidence of the lyric note from *Monna Vanna* onwards is not a mere accident of Maeterlinck's dramatic method. It indicates a significant change that had already come over the poet's outlook on life. It shows that the poet had come out of the world of dreams into the world of reality, not the reality of the naturalists, to be found out by a dissection of social life, but the reality of the romanticists, revealed by an imaginative contact of the soul with the life of mankind in general. The change is to be detected faintly in *Sister Beatrice* and then, with comparative clarity, in *Ardiane and Barbe Bleue* which, from the viewpoint of form, still continues the lyric vein. From *The Intruder* to *Aglavaine and Selysette* (with the exception of *Pelleas and Melisanda*), Maeterlinck's characters are little more than puppets that form almost a part of the atmosphere in which they are placed. If they have any personality, that personality is shadowy, like the personality of figures from ancient legends (28). They are dreamers within their own selves or, at most, hypnotised beings within the bounds of an enchanted world. The eternal heart-beats of struggling humanity die away too far in the distance to reach their ears. *Sister Beatrice* is the first to hear them.

28. That these lyrical plays have something legendary about them was acknowledged by Maeterlinck himself in an interview to one M. Adolphe Brisson described in *Le Temps*, 25 juillet, 1896, as follows :

“Les paysans de chez nous, dit M. Maeterlinck, dont l'intelligence est paresseuse ont coutume de prononcer plusieurs fois les mêmes épithètes ou les mêmes verbes. Cette habitude donne à leur discours un caractère de gravité tout à la fois puéril et sentencieux. Je m'en suis inspiré, jugeant qu'un personnage de légende avait quelque affinité avec un homme des champs et pouvait parler la même langue.....”

(Quoted by Robert de Souza in *La Poesie Populaire et le Lyrisme Sentimental*, p. 133.)

Robert de Souza attributes the lyricism of these plays and also the fatalism of their characters to the indebtedness of these plays to some legends which, however, he cannot identify. (*Ibid.*, pp. 124-26).

This claim cannot be made for Selysette or even Aglavaine. Selysette is like a legendary princess held in duress while Aglavaine is little better than a metaphysician of love. Sister Beatrice tastes of the cup of suffering herself and knows what it means to others. Addressing the Abbess and the other sisters who live within the convent-walls a life of secluded religiosity, she says,

O, you live here and do your penances,
And say your prayers, and seek to expiate sin,
But look you, it is I, and all my kind,
Who live beyond the pale and have no rest,
That do the bitterest penance to the end ! (Act III, p. 81).

In *Ardiane and Barbe Bleue*, the heroine's mission is to set her suffering sisters at liberty and see them happy ; and when this is finished, she goes away, without caring for her own happiness, to offer her services to those who need them :

Selysette. Ardiane, Ardiane !

Where are you going ?

Ardiane. Far away from here.

Down yonder, where I am awaited still.....

(Act III, p. 184).

The broadening of the horizon beyond one's own little life, which is thus first noticed in *Sister Beatrice* and *Ardiane and Barbe Bleue*, is maintained more or less in all the later plays. Monna Vanna offers to sacrifice herself to save the starving citizens of Pisa ; Tyltyl goes out in search of a secret that will bring happiness to mankind ; Mary Magdalene's is a career of revolution ; the Burgomaster, deeply attached to life as he is, boldly faces death as the civic head of his town ; even Tatiana has known privations outside Sonia's boudoir, and Jean d'Ypermonde has been humanised by the contact of a bigger world outside his ancestral château. *Joyxelle* is, perhaps, the only exception among these plays, but it is, after all, an imitation. The men and women in these plays also, characteristically of Maeterlinck, are never violent ; they *do* little ; their personality develops almost entirely through words ; but contact with the outer world and taste of suffering have given them more thought than sentiment, so

that their language is much less emotional and much less lyrical than the language of characters in the earlier 'static' plays. The net result is that they are never shadowy, puppet-like figures. They are fool-blooded, living individuals having their own shares of the sweets and bitters of life.

From *The Intruder* to *Aglavaine and Selysette*, it has been said above, the characters form almost a part of the atmosphere in which they are placed. This is to say that the main artistic interest, sometimes the only artistic interest, of these plays lies in the creation of an atmosphere. Generally speaking, it is an atmosphere of isolation, pervaded by a brooding sense of fatality. The eternal forces of nature run their wonted course: the sea roars, the wind moans, withered leaves flutter, trees stand in silence, their green leaves silvered over with the rays of the moon; the sun sets through the branches of weeping willows; tall cliffs beetle over solitary sea-coasts where mother-birds feed their young ones. It is a world which fate seems to have marked as her own. Here appear a few human beings resigned to fate without any struggle, without any help or sympathy from any fellow-creatures. Indeed, at moments it seems doubtful whether these fated beings belong to the human race that we know. Tall ships silently sail by and sometimes cast anchor off the shore, but none can say from what land they come and whither they are bound; we are not told anything of their passengers. These passive victims of fate end their brief careers, thus cut off from the rest of the world. Their abode is generally an ancient building with a tower and dark underground vaults; sometimes it may be a walled asylum or a single room with long glass-windows and a burning lamp, perfectly silent except, perhaps, for the ticking of a clock. Outside these rooms or buildings there is scarcely any sign of life. Occasionally an unseen shepherd takes his flock home, an unseen gardener plants flowers, or a number of unseen sailors sing in the distance a song of departure; but these only add to the eeriness of the atmosphere. In *Interior* we see a crowd, but that crowd only accompanies a dead body in silence.

The shadowy characters of these lyrical, fatalistic plays cannot be expected to develop anything like a complicated plot. Maeterlinck's plots, whether in the early plays or in the later,

are never complicated. In a piece or two of the early period there is really no story at all ; the creation of an atmosphere serves the purpose. The others have a very brief and simple story developed alongside of the atmosphere, and the two together either reveal the operation of some human passions or suggest the mystery of an unseen world. In the later plays the stories have clearer outlines and are less ethereal in character, but they never attain a complexity worth mentioning beside the story of *King Lear* or *Twelfth Night*. The important figures even in these plays hardly exceed the number three, so that the situation they develop is easily comprehended within a story developing, so to speak, along a single straight line. There is never a story within a story to serve as a parallel or a contrast or in any other way to create a situation subsidiary to the situation in the main story. There is little or nothing of those recognitions and reversals of situation which Aristotle deemed necessary for intensifying the tragic emotions. The interest of the story is sometimes heightened by the introduction of a dilemma and sometimes by the use of irony. The device of a dream has been more than once used to produce a mild shock of surprise ; but placing the spiritual experiences of the central figure within the framework of a dream has its disadvantages as well as advantages. It gives the dramatist perfect liberty to introduce any situation he likes, but it may lead to a lack of logical sequence. Thus in *The Blue Bird* and *The Betrothal* the acts or scenes succeed one another with so little necessary sequence that the plots of these two plays might almost be condemned as what Aristotle calls 'episodic'. The truth about Maeterlinck's plot-making seems to be that he has been more often guided by considerations of evoking a world of beauty through images than of effective story-telling under the conditions of the theatre.

Of the different features of Maeterlinck's dramatic method here detailed, the creation of an atmosphere is a transformation of the dominating feature of the method he employed in his first poetic attempts, *Hot-Houses*. Both in the poems and in the plays the work of this feature is to *suggest*, and suggestion is the essence of symbolism. Symbolism, in some form or other, marks Maeterlinck's creative art in its later as well as earlier stage. In fact, if any one aspect of Maeterlinck's workmanship were to be singled

out as specially characteristic of him, that aspect would be symbolism which will, therefore, be dealt with in a separate study.*



* Passages from the English translations of Maeterlinck's works have been quoted with the kind permission of the publishers, Messrs George Allen & Unwin Ltd. and Messrs Methuen & Co., Ltd.

MODERN PROBLEM PLAYS

P. K. GUHA (DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH)

Very aptly has Mr. A. C. Ward characterized the modern age as an Age of Interrogation¹. The old certainties are no longer recognized as certainties and there is a restless desire on all sides to probe and to question. Things that used to be taken for granted in the various spheres of life,—religion, politics, literature, social and domestic life,—are being bravely challenged and shaken to their very roots. The result is that life and society which had so long presented a body of accepted creeds and settled conventions now offer a confused mass of puzzling complexities. Even such a social pivot as the marriage-bond is no longer treated as sacrosanct, and it now bristles with speculative complications which are providing food for anxious thought to the people of the age.

The novelists and the dramatists of old found nothing sensational or dramatic in the placid complacencies of real life and they had, therefore, to invent imaginary problems, set against a romantic background, to serve as the situations of their stories. But to-day truth appears in a garb stranger than fiction, and thrilling situations of the most diverse kind are lying all about the literary artist in the realm of fact. The postulates and axioms of real life have now turned into "problems", and all the world over these are being seized upon by the literature of the age as ready-made materials for its theme.

The question as to whether the prosaic facts of real life should be allowed to enter into literature or not has only an academic interest now. Possession is nine points of the law. Critical wisdom would, therefore, consist in accepting the inevitable with good grace without indulging in a vain regret for the old spacious times of glorious themes, gathered from the fairy-land of poetic fancy.

In this paper I shall attempt a rough study of the operation of this new factor in the field of English drama. The adoption of the problems of real life as the theme of modern English plays has necessarily imported into them the thoughts and ideas that are

1. A. C. Ward—*Twentieth Century Literature*.

engaging the mind of the world in regard to these problems. But it will be no part of my business here to examine the sociological or speculative soundness of those thoughts and ideas. My occupation will be confined to the legitimate sphere of literary criticism and will consist merely in appraising the artistic and aesthetic value of the efforts of English dramatists of recent times to fashion the problem-theme into literary art. In other words, I shall try to find out how far the modern problem plays of England have succeeded in rising above the level of mere "literature of knowledge" and attaining the plane of "literature of power".

I shall, at the outset, take a hurried retrospect of the origin and growth of English Problem-Drama. In the 18th century English Drama, like English Poetry, was at a low ebb. With the honourable exception of the plays of Goldsmith and Sheridan, who are aptly characterized by a critic as "two palm trees in the desert of 18th century drama", plays of two kinds comprised the entire dramatic output of the century,—light and frivolous farce, burlesque and satire on the one hand, and plays replete with sanctimonious pose and morbid sentimentalism on the other. There were, besides, some heavy and sonorous tragedies, but they too had no contact with life. In short, artificiality and conventionality were all the mode, and these features continued unimpaired all over the first half of the nineteenth century. Here too with the solitary exception of Shelley's *Cenci* we have a mass of unnatural and insignificant plays which a wise posterity has justly cast into the limbo of oblivion. The decadence that thus prevailed over English drama for a period of a century and a half consisted mainly in theatricality and complete divorce from life and nature. This inevitably provoked a reaction towards realism, and a tremendous impetus in this direction was furnished by Ibsen towards the close of the century. But even before the influence of Ibsen came to operate in England, indigenous efforts in the line had already set in and were paving the way for the new realistic drama of the present day.

The most important name to be recalled in this connexion is that of T. W. Robertson whom Marriott calls "the Fairy Prince who woke the sleeping Princess from her hundred years of coma."¹

1. J. W. Marriott—*Great Modern British Plays* :—Preface.

Whatever may be the intrinsic value of Robertson's plays, they occupy the proud position of pioneers in the field of modern realistic drama in England. They make a real attempt to bring the stage into closer touch with life. The artificial speech and theatrical passion, the melodramatic rant and sentimental outburst of the drama that went before, were completely abjured, and the themes were confined to the incidents and situations of real life. It was here that the new movement had its birth, and the year 1865, the date of Robertson's first comedy, *Society*, is, therefore, looked upon as the starting-point of modern drama in England. Henceforth the dramatist approaches his task in a mood of high seriousness and sets before himself the purpose of offering a criticism of life and society. The play ceases to be an idle pastime, becomes thoughtful and introspective and comes to serious grips with the stern realities of life.

Robertson died in 1871 and for about two decades after his death there was no further advance, till during the 'nineties the movement received a fresh fillip at the hands of Bernard Shaw, Arthur Pinero and Henry Arthur Jones. By that time the influence of Ibsen, which had spread vigorously all over the continent for about twenty years, had begun to be felt in England as well. True to her insular tradition, England had at first set her face against the spell of the Norwegian wizard. A Dutchman, Mr. J. T. Grein, first pressed the new drama on her notice. He, together with William Archer and Bernard Shaw, stoutly championed the policy of de-insularizing the British drama. Grein founded the Independent Theatre in 1891, and the people of England gradually came to realize and appreciate the significance of the new type of drama initiated by Ibsen.

Ibsen dealt courageously with the problems which were stirring the minds and hearts of the people of the age. He handled domestic subjects with perfect candour and in an absolutely unconventional manner. He introduced moral and sociological problems of the most delicate kind into his plays. He showed that the dramatist did not require to stray away from real life in search of situations, but he may find enough situations, and to spare, in the countless practical problems which face the people of the world at every moment and urgently call for

dramatization. He proved that the subtlest workings of the human mind and heart, the sharpest clashes and conflicts of thought and feeling may be vividly presented through the problems of every-day life. He was a poet and his imagination enabled him to intensify and magnify the problems, to diagnose and lay them bare. He made drama 'natural' in every way, dispensed with the use of conventional dramatic tricks like the 'aside' and the 'soliloquy' and employed, as far as possible, the language of real life for his dialogues.

Ibsen's "A Doll's House" was first performed in England in 1899. Pinero and Jones proved ready converts to the new movement. Bernard Shaw needed no conversion, for his temperamental tendency towards iconoclasm found something very akin in Ibsen's radical attack on social conventions. Shaw tried to popularize the Ibsen cult in England through his famous critical work, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*.

The subsequent history of Problem-plays in England is essentially a record of Ibsenism in English drama, and there is hardly a play of this type, produced after this, that does not bear some trace or other of the influence of Ibsen, in theme, treatment and sometimes in the very dialogue and diction.

Among the authors of English problem-play in the last part of the 19th century, the name of Pinero, who died recently at the age of 80, emerges into prominence. His *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray* is a masterpiece and is a remarkable work of art with a problem-theme. With this play Pinero made a tremendous bid for leadership in the domain of the new drama, but unfortunately for him his other pieces could not keep up the standard. Shaw stole a march upon him and made himself the recognized protagonist of the new school,—a position which he has maintained ever since. Mr. Vernon speaks of "the great might-have-been that Sir Arthur Pinero is." "The ball was at his feet, but Shaw kicked it."¹

In this connexion we have to mention two other dramatists of the period,—Henry Arthur Jones and Sir John Barrie. Henry Arthur Jones, the author of *Saints and Sinners*, *Liars*, etc., had a hearty hatred of hypocrisy in every form, and this naturally attracted

1. Frank Vernon—*Twentieth Century Theatre*, p. 20.

him towards the plays of Ibsen. But he had mastered his craft independently and received only a stimulus from Ibsen. He confessed that his real teacher was Robertson. His plays were well ordered and were based upon observation and sound instinct. But he was too anxious to preach at his audience and his thoughts did not go deep enough. Neither Pinero nor Jones had the courage to penetrate into the roots of civilized society like Ibsen and Shaw. Still they went far enough to flutter the doves of convention and give a powerful forward push to the new drama.

Sir John Barrie, of *Peter Pan* fame, contributed a great play of this type, namely, *The Admirable Crichton*, the first social drama of the 20th century. It presents a new pattern of problem-play in the shape of an admirable mingling of fantasy and realism.

The problem-plays of Bernard Shaw and John Galsworthy need hardly be recounted in this rapid review. Almost all the dramas of these two great writers are problem-plays. Shaw's *Man and Superman*, *Candida*, *The Doctor's Dilemma*, *The Apple Cart* and Galsworthy's *The Silver Box*, *Strife*, are some of the most striking plays of this class.

The most significant features of the post-war stage of English problem-play are the unflagging freshness and fecundity of Shaw, the emergence of Somerset Maugham and the meteoric conquest of the stage by Noel Coward. Maugham's *Our Betters* and *The Circle* are valuable additions to the list. Noel Coward's *Easy Virtue*, *The Young Idea* are some of the remarkable creations in the line.

Arnold Bennett's *Milestones*, Stanley Houghton's *Hindle Wakes*, Sherriff's *Journey's End*, Massfield's *The Tragedy of Nan* also deserve honourable mention before we close this brief recital of the outstanding productions in modern English problem-drama.

I shall now proceed to measure the artistic value of some of the notable problem-plays. But I would set about it after a short general discussion of the principles of dramatic art that are involved in a critical study of this particular type of play.

If there is one quality more than another that differentiates drama from other forms of literary art, it is objectivity. True drama is perfectly impersonal, and the intrusion of the author's own bias or opinion into the play at once mars its dramatic character. The great distinction of Shakespeare as a dramatist is that he has never

betrayed himself anywhere in his plays. His method was to conceal himself and to reveal life. For three centuries scholars are striving in vain to deduce the moral or political views of William Shakespeare, the man, from his plays. If the personality of the dramatist obtrudes itself upon his play, the author stands between his characters and his audience, and the entire dramatic illusion is lost. Now, the great danger that the use of current problems, as the theme of drama, entails is that it has a strong tendency towards divesting it of this essential virtue of impersonality. Problem-drama, by its very nature, inclines almost irresistibly, towards subjectivity. When a dramatist who, we may presume, is an acute thinker on the problems of the hour, treats of live issues like love and marriage, socialism and individualism, war and peace, capital and labour—it is idle to expect that the writer would always care to conceal his personal bias as though it were a guilty secret or be able to do so even if he tried. Consciously or unconsciously he will identify himself with one side or another. His favourite point of view will invariably receive a passionate emphasis, and there is every likelihood of his shaping his characters and situations in such a way as to attain a most effective and eloquent ventilation of his own views. Macaulay says that as every Englishman has his own party politics, no Englishman can write an impartial history of England. Similarly, as every thinking person has his own individual opinion on the practical problems of the hour, no one can deal with them, in any form, in an entirely dispassionate manner. We should not, therefore, be at all surprised at the frequent spectacle of a problem-play assuming a definitely partisan complexion and even turning into an instrument of propaganda. The proselytizing instinct is inherent in man, and when any opinion strengthens into a conviction in us it strives to convert others into it.

The moment the dramatic author is seized with a passion for converting the world to his own point of view, he “to party gives up what belongs to mankind” and ceases to be an artist. His entire technique is warped by this didactic impulse, his idea gains the upper hand over his story, and his characters turn into illustrative puppets, having no individuality of their own and serving merely as mouthpieces of the author. Problem-plays have become true works of art where the author has approached

his theme in the serene mood of a dispassionate observer, not looking at the question with the narrow vision of a partisan but with an eye "made quiet by the power of harmony and seeing into the life of things."

Our task of examining the problem-plays thus reduces itself to finding out whether the particular specimens which we shall choose for study have succeeded in avoiding the pitfalls of partisanship and propaganda and maintaining that perfect objectivity which is the *sine qua non* of dramatic art.

I would first deal with plays which seem to have failed to attain the character and level of art.

The Apple Cart, the latest of Shavian favourites, is a notable example of the sacrifice of dramatic art to a zeal for propaganda. In the Preface to the play Shaw says that it is "a comedy in which a King defeats an attempt by his popularly elected Prime Minister to reduce him to a cipher." To attain this avowed object Shaw paints the King as an exceptionally shrewd and tactful person and reduces the Prime Minister to a mere cipher. Both are a gross exaggeration and neither produces the impression of flesh-and-blood reality. The members of the Cabinet are shorn of ordinary tact and sagacity and the King, a perfect pattern of good breeding and good sense, is more than a match for all of them put together. What shrewd observations are thrown into the mouth of the King and how trite and commonplace are the words of the Prime Minister! Proteus, the Prime Minister, says,

"I had rather be a dog than the Prime Minister of a country where the only things the inhabitants can be serious about are football and refreshments."

As against this we have from the King a trenchant statement of this kind :—

"I should be very sorry to win, as I cannot carry on without the support of a body of ministers whose existence gives the English people a sensation of self-government."

One naturally suspects that it is Shaw himself speaking here through this King Magnus or King Magnified. It is no wonder that the play has been interpreted by many as a pro-monarchical manifesto. In Dresden, we are told, the staging of it was actually prohibited as a blasphemy against Democracy. Shaw was, of course, greatly

annoyed at this or, shall we say, pretended that he was annoyed and said, "It is never safe to take my plays at their face value." He claimed that "*The Apple Cart* expresses the unreality of both democracy and royalty as our idealists conceive them." But this plea of impartiality is hardly tenable. In order to heap ridicule on the ministers and glorify the King by contrast Shaw creates an absurd scene like this :—

Boanerges, who has just been taken into the Cabinet as President of the Board of Trade, has come to interview King Magnus. He tells the King's Private Secretaries :—

"Look here. The King has an appointment with me at a quarter to twelve. How long more am I to be kept waiting ?.....They say that politeness is the punctuality of kings."

Sempronius—The other way about, Mr. Boanerges. Punctuality is the politeness of kings, and King Magnus is a model in that respect. Your arrival cannot have been announced to His Majesty.

Boanerges—A nice lot of young upstarts you have in this palace.

Pamphilus—And what have our young upstarts been doing to you ?

Boanerges—Well, I told one of them to tell the king I was here, and to look sharp about it. He looked at me as if I was a performing elephant, and took himself away after whispering to another flunkey. Then this other chap comes over to me and pretends he doesn't know who I am ! asks me can he have my name ! "My lad" I said : "not to know me argues yourself unknown. You know who I am as well as I do myself. Go and tell the king I'm waiting for him, d'ye see ?" So he took himself off with a flea in his ear. I waited until I was fed up with it, and then opened the nearest door and came in here.

The King appears and says :—

"You are very welcome to my little palace, Mr. Boanerges. Wont you sit down ?"

Boanerges—I am sitting down.

Magnus—True, Mr. Boanerges. I had not noticed it. Forgive me : force of habit. You will allow me to be seated ?

Boanerges—Oh, sit down, man, sit down. You are in your own house : ceremony cuts no ice with me.

Magnus—(gratefully) Thank you.

Could anything be more farcical than this ? If kings were so meek and forbearing as King Magnus and if members of the Cabinet

were unmannerly bullies like Boanerges, there would, of course, be no objection whatever to the eternal continuance of absolute monarchy and there would be no case at all for democracy.

It is palpably a thesis-play, the characters are mere caricatures and the situations are grotesque. In order to maintain the thesis the dramatist thinks nothing of making a ruthless sacrifice of naturalness of characterization and plausibility of incident.

The Apple Cart is one of the latest of English Problem-plays and we would now turn back to one of the earliest to illustrate the same phenomenon of the sacrifice of art to propaganda. We would choose Sir Arthur Pinero's *Mid-Channel*. The play dramatizes the situation of dull apathy and boredom, "dog-weariness," that is reached by a married couple in middle life—in "mid-Channel". Theodore and Zoe, husband and wife of 14 years' standing, are the hero and heroine of the piece. Each is sick to death of the other. Zoe complains—

"It's tiff, tiff, wrangle, jangle, outdoors and indoors with us..... He's getting so stodgy and pompons and flat-footed. He drives me mad with his elderly ways. ...As for my gowns or my hats—anything I put on—I might dress in sackcloth ; he'd never observe it."

Peter Mottram, a friendly outsider, steps into the breach and attempts the rôle of the peacemaker. He has no other function in the play than to address long speeches to the husband and the wife on "the crass foolishness of it all." They would not pay any heed to him. The husband told him—

"My dear fellow, if you'd get married, and have thirteen or fourteen years of it, as I've had, your views would be worth more than they are."

Peter—Oh, that won't wash. When a man's sufferin' from gout in the toe, he doesn't stipulate that his M. D. shall be writhin' from the same ailment. No, very frequently, the outsider.....

Theodore asked Peter to say something fresh on the subject, if he could, and not repeat the old, stale, platitudes.

Peter—My dear chap, it's tryin' to say somethin' fresh on the subject of marriage that's responsible for a large share of the domestic unhappiness and discontent existin' at the present day. There's too much of this tryin' to say something fresh on *every* subject, in my opinion.

Do we not catch the master's voice in all this ?

Peter continues—"You take it from me, there are two institootions in the world that are never goin' to alter—men and women and the shape of chickens' eggs. Chickens' eggs are never goin' to be laid square; and men and women will continue to be mere men and women till the last contango."

This wise reasoner then trots out a parable :

"About half-way between Dover and Calais—about half-way between Folkestone and Boulogne—mid-Channel—there's a shoal.I've crossed on some of the finest days of the year. The sun's been shinin', and outside the harbour the water's been as smooth as it's been *inside*. Everythin's looked as enticin' as could be; but as we've neared the Ridge—mid-Channel—I've begun to feel fidgety, restless, out o' sorts—hatin' myself and hatin' the man who's been sharin' my cabin with me. But the sensation hasn't lasted long.Gradually the beastly notion has died down, and in a quarter-of-an-hour or so I've found myself pacin' the deck again arm-in-arm with the travellin'-companion I've been positively loathin' a few minutes earlier."

The learned speaker is not content with this. The analogy he is anxious to draw is obvious, but he must rub it in. He continues—

"There's a resemblance between *that* and marriage..., yes, and marriage, mark you, at its best and brightest. The happiest and luckiest of married couples have got to cross that wretched Ridge. However successful the first half of this journey may be, there's the rough-and-tumble of mid-Channel to negotiate. Some arrive there quicker than others, some later; it depends on wind and tide. But they *get* there, and a bad time it is, and must be a time when travellin'-companions see nothin' but the spots on each other's yellow faces, and when innumerable kind words and innumerable kind acts are clean forgotten. But, as I tell you, it's soon over—*well* over, if only Mr. Jack and Mrs. Jill will understand the situation; if only they'll say to themselves, "We're on the Ridge; we're in mid-Channel; in another quarter-of-an-hour the boat'll be steady again—as steady as when we stepped on to the gangway."

This is an extremely ingenious and edifying lecture no doubt. But this is not the stuff of which drama is made. It is obvious

that this reasoner has been introduced into the play by Pinero to serve as his own mouthpiece for giving an expression to his personal views on love and marriage. To make a hired talking-puppet like this the central figure of a drama merely for emphasizing the author's point of view is manifestly undramatic and injures the artistic character of the play as a whole.

In the two examples cited above we find that the author's zeal for propaganda destroys the art of the problem-play by leading to a caricature of characters, creation of absurd situations and introduction of a quantity of undramatic talk and exposition, conveyed through a figure who has no integral connexion with the action of the piece and whose only business is to expound the author's thesis in the play.

Let us now turn to the brighter side of the shield. Here again Shaw heads the list. Among the problem-plays that have achieved signal artistic success his *Candida* is decidedly one of the best. It dramatizes in a remarkably original way the threadbare theme of the old triangle and furnishes an excellent reply to Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. In it Shaw has no axe to grind, and it is a true work of art, perfectly objective. How artistically are the characters of the husband, Morell, and the wife, Candida, drawn and developed! The entrance of Eugene, the wife's lover, into their life, stirs up the heart of both husband and wife to its utmost depths, and they discover the strength of the tie that knit them together and of which they were not at all conscious before. Parson Morell now learns to feel a passionate interest in his wife and even decides to cut a lecturing engagement only to enjoy her company,—a thing he could never have dreamt of doing before. Candida realizes the depth of her husband's affection for her as she had never done and as perhaps she should never have done if the lover had not come in. It is the appearance of the lover on the scene that brings tears to the eyes of Morell for his wife. When Candida asks her husband what he could offer her to win at the contest of love between him and Eugene, Morell said:—

"I have nothing to offer you but my strength for your defence, my honesty for your surety, my ability and industry for your livelihood, and my authority and position for your dignity. That is all it becomes a man to offer to a woman.....What I am you have

made with the labor of your hands and the love of your heart. You are my wife, my mother, my sisters : you are the sum of all loving care to me."

He has an easy win. Candida's heart is deeply touched, as it could not but be, for what husband has ever given a more touching expression to his boundless love, gratitude and admiration for his wife ?

And what a noble response does this passionate overture of the husband inspire in the wife ! Candida says to Eugene :—

"Ask me what it costs to be James's mother and three sisters and wife, and mother to his children all in one...Ask the tradesmen who want to worry James and spoil his beautiful sermons who it is that puts them off. When there is money to give, he gives it : when there is money to refuse, I refuse it. I build a castle of comfort and indulgence and love for him, and stand sentinel always to keep little vulgar cares out. I make him master here, though he does not know it, and could not tell you a moment ago how it came to be so. And when he thought I might go away with you, his only anxiety was—what should become of me !"

Could any dramatist do it better ? It is the real thing. Shaw might be determined usually to convert his plays into a mere medium of expression for giving the widest publicity to his views and inducing the world to accept them. But there are occasions on which the artist in him refuses to be kept down and Shaw stumbles into art in spite of himself.

We have put down a play of Pinero too on the black list, and it is only fair to him to make up for it by mentioning here his masterpiece, *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray*, and citing it as an example of brilliant artistic success, as it undoubtedly is. The problem that forms the theme of the play is as to whether it is possible to rear a life of happiness, of good repute, on a miserable foundation. Aubrey, the hero of the piece, tries the experiment by marrying Paula, a woman with a past. Aubrey launched the project with the notion that he would be all alone in the life that he would live. But a fine dramatic surprise is provided by the unexpected return of Ellean, a daughter of Aubrey by his

deceased first wife, and this leads to endless complications. Aubrey finds it impossible to defy public opinion, he is unable to forget Paula's past and the most disastrous results follow. The moral of the piece emerges through the development of the situation and the reaction of the characters to it as it grows under our eyes. There is, of course, a *confidant*, Cayley, to whom Aubrey explains his plans and motives. One would wish this character away, for he strikes one as a puppet, created to help the dramatist in making his meaning clear. But he is not obtrusive like Peter Mottram of *Mid-Channel*. Barring this figure, the other characters are perfectly alive, the sequence of events is plausible and there is a refreshing absence of any attempt at direct preaching to the audience.

Another fine example of a supreme artistic triumph in the line is furnished by Sir John Barrie's *The Admirable Crichton*. Barrie never forgets that a drama is, after all, a story, and that nothing should be introduced into a play that would impair its story-interest. The problem handled in the piece is the old question of the gradation of ranks, the distinction between master and servant. Lord Loam, a member of the British peerage, professed to be extremely democratic, talked constantly of a return to Nature and even gave monthly tea parties to his servants in his drawing-room, at which his daughters had to serve the servants at the table. By a strange freak of circumstance Lord Loam, with his nephew, daughters and Steward, Crichton, was marooned in a far-off island. There they were thrown perforce into a state of Nature for which Lord Loam used to profess an ardent desire. Crichton now finds an opportunity to show the superior mettle of which he is made. While Lord Loam and his daughters and his nephew are thoroughly nonplussed by the unexpected mishap, Crichton proves himself a man and saves the situation almost single-handed. Unaided he improvises food, clothing and shelter for them all and automatically comes to be looked upon and treated as the most important and powerful person in the party. The tables are completely turned. The Steward becomes the master and the master becomes the servant. His daughters vie with one another for winning Crichton's hand. The eldest succeeds and considers herself supremely lucky.

Events now take a dramatic turn. The party is rescued and brought home. On return to civilization the normal order of things and ranks returns. Crichton again becomes the obedient and dutiful steward and Lord Loam reverts to his birth-right. His eldest daughter marries her former betrothed, the son of a Lord.

No speeches are made by any of the characters. But simply through the development of the situation the meaning that the writer has in view is brought home to us. Although no arguments are advanced the play is a powerful argument for the claims of God's natural noblemen as against the rights of the artificial peerage of civilized society. A curious world of fantasy is created to develop the situation, but the cleavage between the actual and the fanciful does not prevent the play from providing a critical commentary on the great social problem that forms the subject-matter of the piece. And it comes all the more forcibly to us because we imbibe it ourselves from the significance of a story that we thoroughly enjoy as story from beginning to end, and because nowhere does the author thrust himself upon us with direct moralizing.

The author offers no remedy for the problem, he merely points to its existence and leaves it at that. The play is supremely effective at once as a drama and as social criticism.

Fortunately among the English problem-plays direct propaganda is the exception rather than the rule. The majority belong to the class of *The Admirable Crichton* and its lineal descendants like *The Silver Box*, *Strife*, etc., which merely raise questions about social problems and leave audiences to draw their own conclusions.

We are now in a position to attempt a formulation of the principles which the problem-play of the right type has to follow. In this connexion we might recall the famous statement in which the great Irish dramatist of modern times, J. M. Synge, sums up the essence of a true drama. "Drama is made serious not by the degree in which it is taken up with problems that are serious in themselves, but by the degree in which it gives the nourishment, not very easy to define, on which our imaginations live.The drama, like the symphony, does not teach or prove anything."¹

1. J. M. Synge—Preface to *The Tinker's Wedding*.

The problem-play, like all other kinds of play, and, for the matter of that, like all other forms of art, must furnish something permanent and abiding to feed the imagination. It does this only when it portrays facts in such a way as to make them of universal significance, namely, by stressing, instead of the external facts of life, the thoughts and emotions of the characters. The centre of gravity of the play has to be shifted from without to within. The problem is only the raw material of the drama, the presentation of the human reaction is the finished product. The exposition of the problem is only the means, the unfolding of character is the end. Problems may not come into literature for their own sake but only as revelations of the inner workings of the mind and heart. Shakespeare made use of romantic situations for achieving this purpose. Ibsen employed situations of real life for attaining the same object. Between the technique of Shakespeare and that of Ibsen the difference is only in regard to the nature of the raw materials used, the finished product aimed at is the same in either case—and that is Man. As Shaw tells us, "Shakespeare had put ourselves on the stage but not our situations.Ibsen gives us not only ourselves, but ourselves in our own situations."¹ It is 'ourselves' that is given us by both.

In regard to characterization the author of the problem-play should take good care to see that his characters are not mere illustrations of a set of ideas which he is anxious to communicate. The characters should be left to grow and develop along their own lines, often straying away beyond the scope of the play, in the abundance and overflow of their own vitality. They must have the extra line that presents the contour of life and they should not merely talk but act, and things should happen to them. They might, for instance, quite legitimately fall ill and even die unexpectedly, merely, for producing an illusion of reality. The death of the wife of Roberts, the Labour leader, in Galsworthy's *Strife* is simply meant to lend verisimilitude to the story and no deeper meaning need be read into it, such as has been suggested by some ingenious critics. Referring to the character of Martin Leeds, the hero of Wells's *The Secret Places of the Heart*, Ward aptly remarks that it is a relief to find Leeds developing a carbuncle in course

1. B. Shaw—*The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, p. 202.

of the story. He says, "That carbuncle gleams for the reader like a cheerful lamp through a fog of seemingly endless talk. To have ideas is noble ; to have carbuncles human."¹

The ideas underlying the problem-drama should not spread out beyond the story. The play should be tightly woven together, characters and ideas forming the warp and woof and the story appearing on the finished texture. In his recent book, *Experiment in Autobiography*, H. G. Wells confesses that in his novels he could not succeed in covering his ideas with his story. Despite all his efforts to enlarge the novel's scope it "proved a blanket too small for the bed, and when I tried to pull it over to cover my tossing conflict of ideas, I found I had to abandon questions of individuation."² This very frequently happens to Bernard Shaw in his problem-plays. He has such a large number of ideas in his mind, all struggling for expression, that he has to turn almost all his characters into his mouthpieces, dictating Napoleon-like to six Secretaries at the same time.

As for the attitude that the author of the problem-play should adopt towards the point at issue, it should be one of perfect neutrality. But this would be no pose but a sincere expression of the true artist's catholicity of outlook, born of an imaginative insight into the core of things where the seeming discords and differences of outer life merge and coalesce. This judicial impartiality would not be the result of a lukewarm interest in the problem but of an equally passionate feeling for both sides of the question, both being ultimately human. The dramatist will not judge, will not condemn, he will only lay bare, point out and leave the world to pause and ponder. The true artist is never a party man. He is of the centre. A magnificent illustration of such artistic neutrality is furnished by the problem-plays of Galsworthy.

There should not be any direct moralizing. As Diderot says "I don't want clever maxims on our stage, but impressions."³ Direct preaching implies an intellectual arrogance which smacks of mediaevalism and can never be tolerated in the present democratic

1. A. C. Ward—*The Nineteen-Twenties*, p. 32.

2. H. G. Wells—*Experiment in Autobiography*—Vol. II., p. 496.

3. B. H. Clark—*European Theories of the Drama*, p. 289.

age. It is also much less effective than the indirect, insinuating appeal of aesthetic impressions. Ward rightly observes in regard to the problem-novels of Wells—"Wells might have laughed us into his Utopia but he will never fuss us into it."¹ Literature must entertain while it instructs, if it aims at instructing. It must persuade, not harangue. To quote Diderot again, "I agree that a dramatist may introduce points in his play which the spectator may apply to himself; let him ridicule people and predominant vices, and public events; let him instruct and please, provided he does not think about it. If the audience detects his purpose he will fail to achieve it; he ceases to write drama, and only preaches."²

The propagation of ideas, the propounding of theses, is the bane of the problem-play. Many a quack writer, entirely innocent of the artistic vein, has been flocking to the field merely for making a parade of some ill-assimilated knowledge and learning. Henry Arthur Jones is not at all too severe on this class of writers when he makes the following bitterly sardonic attack on them:—

"What about the other eminent critics and dramatists who have discovered that it is the first business of the play-wright not to have a story or a plot, but to have "ideas" and a "mission," to sweep up social abuses, to debate endlessly upon social questions and disputed points in sociology... The successful dramatists of the past were lamentably ignorant of psychology, sociology and heredity. They were obliged to construct their plays on the vicious principle of telling the interesting story in a well-framed concrete scheme; and by this means their plays have secured a permanent popularity,—which is a reprehensible thing to lovers of "ideas". But what modern playwright will take infinite trouble to learn the difficult task of constructing a play, when he can gain the reputation of being not only a great dramatist, but also a profound thinker by the easy expedient of tossing a few psychological or sociological "ideas" about the stage with the careless freedom of a happy hay-maker? It is very hard to obey laws; it is very easy to have "ideas". "Ideas" enforce no restrictions; they need not be even pursued; they need only be dangled and aired, and left to float away."³

1. A. C. Ward—*The Nineteen-Twenties*, p. 32.

2. B. H. Clark—*European Theories of the Drama*, p. 299.

3. Henry Arthur Jones—Introduction to Brunetière's "Law of the Drama."

In spite of such abuse of the problem-theme, which is consigning a large number of plays of the type to an exceedingly ephemeral existence, there is no reason to apprehend that the genuine plays of this class should fail to attain a permanent interest merely because they deal with current problems. If the problem-play goes down to the bed-rock of human nature it is sure to live. One touch of nature maketh all the ages kin. Problems may vary from age to age but the feelings and sensations of man as a suffering and enjoying human being continue the same through all times. There is a beautiful observation of Mr. Harold Williams in regard to this :—

“Art has no direct concern with passing problems as politics, morals and social economics ; its foundations are fixed upon the unchanging in human nature—emotional reaction to experience. And this emotional reaction is always the same....The triumph of the financier on the Stock Exchange is essentially the savage pleasure of his aboriginal forefather when he slew his prey with a flint-headed spear ; the joy of the aeronaut in swift flight differs in nothing from the ecstasy of the Indian shooting broken rapids in a frail canoe.”¹

I would now conclude with a few general remarks on the place of purpose in literature, so far as the question relates to the present study. Purpose, in itself, is not taboo in literature, and purpose is not necessarily incompatible with art. Literature has infinite powers of annexation and affiliation. Instead of being alarmed at the rapidly increasing use that is being made to-day of the drama and the novel for the rousing of social conscience by a treatment of current problems, we should rather accord it a warm welcome. When Bernard Shaw comes baffled from the press and the platform and turns to drama for capturing the heart of the world we should take it as a tremendous compliment to art. Lovers of literature have only to see that these would-be teachers do not infringe the fundamental laws of art and that things which should have appeared in the form of tracts or treatises do not masquerade in artistic robes and seek to pass off as literature.

Even if literature aims at the attainment of a moral purpose we need not denounce it on that account. So long as it is real art

1. Harold Williams—*Modern English Writers*, p. 295.

it is free to achieve whatever purpose it chooses to set before itself. There is no reason why the literary artist should not be allowed to produce art which is both "good art" and "great art" in Walter Pater's sense of the expressions. What higher purpose could literature seek to achieve than that of serving as an instrument of social and moral good, consistently with the maintenance of its character as art? What earthly objection could there be to an author starting with a purpose and finishing by producing a work of art? What harm to literature could proceed from him even if he came to scoff, provided he remains to pray?

I would end with the inspiring words of Diderot:—

"How mankind would be benefited were all the arts of imitation to seek a common end and came together with laws forcing us to love virtue and despise vice? It is the philosopher's place to invite them; he it is who must turn to the poet, the painter, the musician, and cry aloud, "Men of Genius, why has Heaven endowed you with gifts?" If the artists give heed to him, soon the images of debauchery covering our palace walls will disappear; our voices will no longer be the organs of crime; good taste and good customs and morals will gain inestimably."¹

1. B. H. Clark—*European Theories of the Drama*, p. 289.

ON THE TRANSFER OF THE CAPITAL OF
MUGHAL BENGAL FROM RAJ MAHAL
TO DACCA (JAHANGIRNAGAR) BY
ISLAM KHAN CHISHTI.

DR. S. N. BHATTACHARYYA., M.A., PH.D.,

Lecturer, Dacca University.

Much misconception and difference of opinion seem to be current regarding the transfer of the capital of the *subah* of Bengal from Raj Mahal to Dacca during the early years of the reign of the Mughal Emperor Jahangir. Islam Khan Chishti, who ruled as the viceroy in Bengal for five years, from 1608 to 1613, has generally been regarded as the founder of the city of Dacca. He has also been credited to be the builder of a new capital there, which was formally inaugurated and renamed Jahangirnagar in honour of the reigning sovereign.

Different motives have been attributed to Islam Khan in regard to the transfer of the capital. While some historians have laid undue emphasis on the Magh and Feringi raids as the reason of the transfer, others have almost ignored them, and have solely confined their attention to the hostilities of Usman Afghan and Masnad-i-Ala Musa Khan and his associates in explaining that incident.

Opinions differ also regarding the time when the change of capital was made. The most favoured date seems to be 1608 A.D., obviously on the authority of Stewart, but a later date, 1612 A.D., has also been suggested by Gladwin, and accepted by Taylor, Hunter, Wright, and others.

In short, some of the most essential points regarding the transfer—its precise nature, the manner in which it was effected, the real reasons that contributed to it, and the exact moment when it was accomplished—have not so far been attempted to be solved with any approach to finality.

Dr. N. K. Bhattachali, Curator, Dacca Museum, is the last writer on this subject. In a learned paper entitled "The English

Factory at Dacca (Bengal: Past and Present: Vol. XXXIII. January-June, 1927)", he has cleared up some of the prevailing fallacies regarding the transfer of capital, but the limited scope of the article has necessarily led him to deal with some of the points only, and these too rather briefly.

The discovery within recent times of some new material for the history of Bengal during the reign of the Emperor Jahangir renders the present attempt at a more exhaustive and minute study of the nature, manner, circumstances, and the time of the transfer of the provincial capital from Raj Mahal to Dacca quite feasible.

The most important original source is the Persian manuscript *Baharistan-i-Ghaibi*, written by an imperial officer of the Bengal *subah*, named Mirza Nathan Alau-d din Isfahani, later on created Shitab Khan by the Emperor Jahangir¹. It professes to be a history of Bengal and Orissa under the three *subahdars* Islam Khan (1608-13), Qasim Khan (1613-17), and Ibrahim Khan Fathjang (1617-24), and during the usurpation of the government by the rebel prince Shah Jahan for about a year (part of 1624 and 1625). The work is divided into four books, and the first book deals with the viceroyalty of Islam Khan, and has been entitled by the author the *Islamnamah* (p. 140b).

Though the *Baharistan* does not tell us expressly anything regarding the change of capital by Islam Khan, it offers for the first time a minute account of the Bengal viceroy's activities from the beginning to the end (pp. 1b-140b), and thus provides an excellent background for a critical study of our subject. Further we can glean from the detailed narrative of Mirza Nathan something about the nature of Islam Khan's transfer of the capital, the reasons why he did so, as also the time when it was accomplished. In short, the *Baharistan* well compensates for the paucity of material noticeable in the official chronicles of the period, particularly in the *Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri*, and is also of great corroborative value.

1. For details of the *Baharistan* and its historical value, see J B O R S. Vol. VII. Part I. March 1921; A History of Mughal North-East Frontier Policy, Introduction, 7-9; Journal of Indian History, Vol. XI. Part III. Dec., 1932, Vol. XIII. Part III. December, 1934, and Vol. XIV. Part I, April, 1935; Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. X.No. 4. Dec., 1934.

In addition to the *Baharistan*, the manuscript diary of Abdul Latif, a follower of Abul Husain who was appointed *diwan* of Bengal in 1608, describing his journey in the train of his master and Islam Khan, the new governor, in Bihar and Bengal up to Ghoraghat, throws some light on Islam Khan's itinerary prior to his advance to Dacca, thus corroborating to some extent the narrative of the *Baharistan*². Another Persian manuscript, the *Continuation* of the *Fathiyah-i-Ibriyah* by Shihabu-d din Talish (Bodleian 589 : Sachau and Ethe No. 240),³ giving the history of Bengal from Mir. Jumla's death to the conquest of Chittagong by Shaista Khan in 1666 A. D., includes a graphic account of the Magh and Feringi raids into Lower Bengal, particularly in the reign of Jahangir, and this has an important bearing on our subject. For the prevention of these raids formed one of the main motives of Islam Khan in changing the capital to Dacca. An important Portuguese work, Antonio Bocarro's *Decada XIII da Historia da India* (1612-1617), offers the earliest and the most reliable account of the career of the Portuguese adventurer Sebastian Gonzalves, incidentally illuminating the part played by the Portuguese pirates in Bengal politics of Islam Khan's time.

So far for the new material. A more intensive use of the comparatively scanty material handled by previous writers and available in the standard Persian works such as the *Akbarnamah*, the *Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri*, the *Iqbalnamah-i-Jahangiri*, the *Maasir-ul-Umara*, etc., as also in the accounts of foreigners like Sir Thomas Roe, Herbert, Father Manrique, and Tavernier, has also been made with a view to rendering the present attempt as thorough as possible.

My justification for taking up this subject of very limited scope is that it is historically important, and, what is more, is of especial local interest.

As I have already suggested, the essential points in connection with our subject are three in number :—

2. For details, see J B O R S, Vol. V. 1919, and *Prabashi*, Aswin, B. S. 1326.

3. See J A S B, 1906 and 1907, for an abstract of its contents, and for an English rendering of three long passages bearing on our subject.

(1) The precise nature and manner of the transfer of the provincial capital from Raj Mahal to Dacca.

(2) The causes of the transfer.

(3) The time when it was accomplished.

A critical and detailed survey of the political changes in Bengal from the time of its formal conquest in the last quarter of the sixteenth century till the complete subjection of the independent zamindars there towards the beginning of the second decade of the seventeenth century is necessary at this stage for the elucidation of the three main points indicated above.

Throughout the last quarter of the sixteenth century, Bengal, 'the house of turbulence,' as it was aptly termed by Abul Fazl, was a source of constant trouble to the Mughal government. The defeat and death of Daud Kararani, the last of the independent Afghan rulers, in 1576 A. D., had only nominally transferred the sovereignty of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa to the Mughal Emperor Akbar. He had yet to fight hard and long to consolidate his authority against the numerous Afghan and Hindu zamindars strongly established in that region. For more than fifteen years, there were repeated risings in Bihar, Orissa, and in North and West Bengal. When these were quelled, the imperial officers turned their attention to South and East Bengal. The most formidable enemies of the Mughal government here were Isa Khan Masnad-i-Ala and the Twelve Bhuiyas, Usman Afghan, and Chand Rai and Kedar Rai.

Isa Khan was the master of a vast territory comprising about a half of the present Dacca District, half of modern Tipperah, the greater part of Mymensingh, and perhaps some portions of Rangpur, Bogra, and Pabna. The centre of Isa's authority was, however, the strategic region south-east of modern Dacca, where the Ganges (Padma), the Lakhya, and the Brahmaputra formerly met. Khizrpur, on the left bank of the Lakhya, about a mile north-east of modern Narayanganj (and near the confluence of the three rivers), was an important fort. Opposite Khizrpur stood Katrabau, and opposite Narayanganj, Kadamrasul, two other fortified posts. About three miles east of Khizrpur, and nine miles south-east of Dacca, was Sonargaon, the capital. The tract east of the Brahmaputra in Mymensingh, extending to the eastern portion of the Sylhet District, was in possession of Usman, whose stronghold was Bokainagar, on

the left bank of the Brahmaputra, about 62 miles due north of Dacca. The *parganah* of Bikrampur, on the left bank of the Ganges, covering the southern portion of Dacca District, formed the dominion of Chand Rai and Kedar Rai. Sripur, on the Kaliganga river, nine miles south of Sonargaon, was their capital.

Such was the disposition of the hostile forces when Raja Man Singh assumed the viceroyalty of Bengal in the spring of 1594. He abandoned the old capital at Tanda, and founded a new one at Raj Mahal on the Ganges (Oct., 1595). He then led a number of campaigns against Isa Khan, Usman Afghan, and Kedar Rai.

It is in connection with these protracted encounters of Raja Man Singh with the rebellious zamindars of south-eastern Bengal that Dacca first comes into prominence in Mughal history. It was already the seat of an imperial *thanah*, as the *Akbarnamah* tells us. But it was too near the domain of Isa Khan and Usman Afghan to be immune from their depredations. In fact, as early as 1584, it appears to have been captured, and its *thanahdar*, Sayyid Husain, imprisoned by Isa Khan. The neighbouring *thanah* of *Bhowal*, about 17 miles north-east of Dacca (Rennell's Map VI), too probably passed into the hands of Isa Khan¹.

So long as Isa Khan lived, these imperial outposts do not seem to have been recovered. It was not till three years had elapsed after the death of Isa Khan (which occurred in the autumn of 1599) that the *thanahs* were reoccupied, and used, as the *Akbarnamah* tells us, by Raja Man Singh, as the base of operations against Daud Khan, son of Isa Khan, Usman Afghan, and Kedar Rai.

Usman now figures as the leader of the Afghan malcontents. He took advantage of Man Singh's temporary absence in Ajmere to inflict a severe defeat on the imperialists. The Raja hastened to Bengal and soon recovered the lost ground. He took up his quarters in Dacca in February, 1602, and began to make earnest preparations for a final contest with the rebels.

Kedar Rai at this time made a show of submission, but Usman did nothing of the kind, and again turned aggressive. He suddenly crossed the Brahmaputra and captured an imperial *thanah* (probably Alapsingh), driving the *thanahdar* to take shelter in Bhowal. Thereupon the Bengal viceroy marched from Dacca towards Bhowal,

1. *Akbarnamah*, III. pp. 657-60 (Beveridge).

whence he moved northwards along the river Lakhya till he came to close quarters with Usman. The Afghan chief was again defeated and driven back with heavy loss. The *thanah* of Bhowal was strengthened, and Raja Man Singh returned to Dacca².

The defeat of Usman put the other zamindars, particularly Daud Khan, son of Isa Khan, and Kedar Rai, on their mettle, and they jointly prepared for a serious encounter on the bank of the Ichhamati, probably at a place named Jatrapur, about 25 miles west of Dacca, where Isa Khan had a strong fort. An imperial force sent against them failed to cross the river Ichhamati and came back discomfited. This made the Bengal viceroy take the field in person. From Dacca, he marched westwards to Shahpur, on the right bank of the Dhalleswari (about 15 miles north-west of Dacca, and 12 miles east of Jatrapur, Rennell's Map VI), whence he moved farther west and reached the bank of the Ichhamati. He crossed the river in face of the strong opposition offered by Daud Khan and Kedar Rai, and ultimately compelled them to evacuate their stronghold and retire to their own capitals, Sonargaon and Sripur. After this victory, Man Singh returned to Dacca (c. March, 1602)³.

A new enemy now appears on the scene—the king of Arrakan (the 'Magh Raja' of Abul Fazl). Taking advantage of the internal troubles engaging the sole attention of the Mughal government, the Arrakan king Minpalaung (Sikandar Shah, 1571-1593) steadily stretched his arms northwards till the whole of Chittagong and the greater part of Noakhali and Tipperah came under his sway. His son Minyazagyi (Salim Shah, 1593-1612) followed his father's example, and proved to be a serious menace to the Mughal peace in Bengal.

Another, and probably a more troublesome, element had already made its appearance in Bengal. It was the Portuguese searovers, commonly styled the Feringi pirates. As their name indicates, they were not lawful subjects of the king of Portugal, and owed no allegiance to his representative at Goa. Nor did they submit themselves to the authority of the Arrakan king, though they established colonies in his territories and sometimes faught under

2. *Akbarnamah*, III. pp. 1151, 1174, 1179-80, 1213-14.

3. *Akbarnamah*, III. pp. 1214-15.

his banner. They had two strong settlements in the domain of the Arrakan king, one at Dianga (20 miles south of Chittagong town, and south of the mouth of the Karnafuli river), and the other at Syriam, a noted part in Burma.

The Portuguese free-booters were very often in alliance with the local people of Chittagong, commonly known as the Maghs, who were a race of competent seamen, living a similiar piratical life. They were subject to little control of the Arrakan king, though they often joined him in his military excursions into Mughal Bengal.

Towards the end of the spring of 1603, the Arrakan king invaded Bengal with a large fleet. Kedar Rai, the zamindar of Sripur, smarting under the humiliating defeat sustained at the hands of the Bengal viceroy in March, 1602, now seems to have joined the Arrakan king. The allies marched in the direction of Sonargaon and laid siege to the imperial outpost at Tribeni ('Parmmahani' of Abul Fazl.)⁴ The local *thanahdar* somehow succeeded in repelling the invaders, but the latter fell upon the neighbouring outposts and reduced the garrisons to great straights. When the Bengal vicerey heard of the success of the enemy, he promptly left his headquarters at Dacca and came to the scene. A number of skirmishes on land and water followed, in one of which the imperialists captured one hundred boats of the Arrakan king, yet no decisive result ensued.

A few months later (c. Oct.,—Nov., 1603), there was a recurrence of hostilities. The outpost of Srinagar⁵ now formed the target of attack of the combined forces of the Arrakan king and Kedar Rai. A naval battle was faught near Bikrampur, in which Kedar Rai was totally defeated and severely wounded, and many of his followers, including Feringis, were killed. Kedar died of his wounds soon after he was brought before Raja Man Singh. 'With his death,

4. Tribeni, according to Jatindra Nath Roy, *Dhakar Itihash*, I, p. 472, is the place where the Brahmaputra (Meghna), Lakhya, and Dhalleswari have met opposite Narayanganj.

5. Srinagar was situated on a bank of the Kaliganga river, and it was renamed Fathjangpur by Raja Man Singh after his final victory over Kedar Rai — *Vide Dhakar Itihash*, Vol. I. pp. 485-86.

says Abul Fazl, 'the flames of disturbance in Bengal were extinguished,' and the territories of Kedar Rai passed into the possession of the Mughal Emperor⁶.

6. *Akbarnamah*, III. pp. 1231-32, 1235-36 (E. and D. VI. pp. 109) ; *Iqbalnamah* (Bib. Indica series).

A good deal of confusion prevails regarding this interesting episode. Campos (History of the Portuguese in Bengal, pp. 67-72), relying almost entirely on the evidence of the Portuguese chroniclers, particularly Du Jarric, interprets it primarily as a contest between the Arrakan King and the Portuguese adventurer Carvalho, over the possession of the island of Sandwip, in the early part of which Kedar Rai helped the Arrakan King with 100 *kosahs*. Unable to cope with the Arrakan King, Carvalho subsequently took refuge with Kedar Rai, and fought on his behalf against the Mughal admiral Mandarai, killing him and destroying his fleet.

Mr. Jogendra Gupta, the biographer of Kedar Rai, on the other hand, depending obviously on a mistranslation of Du Jarric's narrative (as also Nikhil Nath Rai in his "Pratapaditya"), makes Kedar Rai help not the Arrakan king but Carvalho in the struggle for the mastery of Sandwip.

Mr. Gupta then gives a graphic account (based partly on Du Jarric and partly on hearsay) of four sanguinary battles fought by his hero, aided mostly by Carvalho and his Portuguese soldiers, against the Mughals. In the first engagement, the Mughal admiral Mandarai was defeated and slain, and his fleet destroyed. In the second and third encounters, Kedar Rai won equal success, but in the fourth, he was defeated and captured, and finally died of wounds.

Mr. Gupta's accounts of the second and third battles are admittedly based on hearsay, and stand entirely uncorroborated. The story of the first engagement is obviously based on Du Jarric and that of the fourth on the *Akbarnamah* as translated (not quite accurately) in Elliot and Dowson's History, VI. p. III.

It seems possible to reconstruct the history of this episode, at least in outline, by a careful and critical analysis of the evidence furnished by Abul Fazl, Mu'tamad Khan (author of the *Iqbalnamah-i-fahangiri*) and Du Jarric. Making proper allowance for the natural tendency towards exaggeration of the achievements and also extenuation of the discomfitures of their own people, it appears clear that the parties in the contest were the Mughals on one side, and the Arrakan king and Kedar Rai, aided by Carvalho, on the other side, and that there were two different campaigns, in the first of which there was no decisive result, but in the second Kedar Rai was totally defeated and captured.

Raja Man Singh returned to Dacca, but was soon called upon to disarm Usman who had again turned hostile. An expeditionary force was gathered at the *thanah* of Bhowal. Just at that moment, the news of resumption of hostilities on the part of the Arrakan king led the Bengal viceroy to alter his plan. From Bhowal he proceeded against the new enemy, but the Arrakan king voluntarily withdrew from the contest. Usman too changed his attitude and repaired to his own territory (c. spring of 1604).⁷

Thus as the result of strenuous exertions for about two years (1602-1604) on the part of Raja Man Singh, the political situation in Bengal for a time appeared to be satisfactory. The Bengal viceroy made adequate arrangements for keeping his hold firm over the newly acquired domain of Bikrampur and came back to Dacca. He felt so much at ease that he soon left his headquarters for Nazirpur (38 miles east of Maldah town, on the bank of the Atrai), where he spent the rains of 1604, probably in *khedah* work (Islam Khan did the same in 1609, *Baharistan*, 10a).⁸

Man Singh was recalled from Bengal in 1606, and he was followed in quick succession by two viceroys, whose rule was uneventful. The next important ruler was Islam Khan Chishti, who assumed charge of his office at Raj Mahal about the beginning of the rains in 1608.

Islam Khan was young and inexperienced, but exceedingly able and ambitious, and enjoyed the full confidence of the Mughal

Abul Fazl and Mu'tamad Khan do not mention Mandarai and Carvalho, made so much of by Du Jarric. Similarly, Du Jarric does not refer to Kedar Rai's final defeat at the hands of Man Singh, which is vividly narrated by Abul Fazl and Mu'tamad Khan. Mandarai's existence appears to be very doubtful. But Carvalho plays too prominent a part in the history of the times to be relegated to oblivion. Probably Carvalho fought in both the campaigns, along with his old enemy, the Arrakan King, on the side of Kedar Rai. The *Iqbalnamah*, though not specifically mentioning Carvalho, distinctly refers to the Feringis fighting on behalf of Kedar Rai in the final encounter. The necessity of presenting a united front in face of their common enemy, the Mughals, might well have led the Arrakan king and Carvalho to patch up a truce and work for a common end, as they actually did afterwards.

7. *Akbarnamah*, III, p. 1236.

8. *Akbarnamah*, pp. 1240.

Emperor. He resolved to take up the unfinished task of Raja Man Singh and consolidate the imperial authority in south-eastern Bengal.

The political position there had grown worse since the time of Man Singh. The repeated defeats suffered by Usman had not at all cooled his military ardour, and he was still ever ready for a surprise attack on the imperial territories. The death of Kedar Rai was indeed a welcome event. But with the conquest of his extensive territories in Bikrampur, the Mughal government was brought into direct and more bitter conflict with Musa Khan, son of Isa Khan. He and his twelve confederates grew so much alarmed at the rapid extension of Mughal sway that they began to make vigorous preparations to check it.

One of the earliest acts of Islam Khan was the recovery of the *thanah* of Alapsingh (*parganah* Alapsingh, on the western bank of the Brahmaputra, in Mymensingh District) from the hands of Usman Afghan. Profiting by the change of governors, Usman had suddenly seized the *thanah* and killed the *thanahdar* (c. June, 1608). A strong force was despatched from Raj Mahal, and Usman was compelled to evacuate the *thanah*. The Bengal viceroy then made himself busy in organising his forces so that he might, at the end of the rains, proceed towards *Bhati* (East Bengal) to deal with Musa Khan and his followers. Early in December, 1608, Islam Khan left Raj Mahal and marched down the Ganges towards Lower Bengal. Just before his departure from the capital, emissaries from Raja Pratapaditya of Jessore came tendering submission to the Emperor and offering personal service when necessary. When the Bengal viceroy reached Alaipur (15 miles south-east of Rampur-Boalia, Rajshahi), Usman also offered submission through an envoy (2nd January, 1609). Islam Khan spent two months in camp at Alaipur, and then (c. 2nd March, 1609) proceeded towards Nazirpur for *khedahs*. At Bazrapur (15 miles north of Natore, Dt. Rajshahi), Pratapaditya interviewed Islam Khan and personally acknowledged the imperial suzerainty.⁹

These professions of loyalty by two of the most powerful and wealthy zamindars of Lower Bengal came as a great relief to the Bengal viceroy. He now felt free to direct all his attention towards

9. *Baharistan*, 3b, 5a, 9a : Abdul Latif's Diary in *Prabashi*, *Aswin*, 1326 B. S., pp. 552-53.

disarming Musa Khan and his associates. But before he could proceed against them, he thought it necessary to safeguard his line of communications by subduing the numerous zamindars whose territories lay on the way. One by one, the zamindars of Bhushnah, Shahzadapur, Sonabaju, Bhaturiabaju, Hijli etc. (roughly covering the territories now included in Pabna, Bogra, Rajshahi, and Jessore Districts) were reduced to vassalage.

The Bengal viceroy suspended military operations on the approach of the rains. He crossed the Karatoya at Shahpur (in Pabna District, 35 miles south-west of Ghoraghat), and then proceeded to Ghoraghat, the seat of a strong imperial outpost, where he encamped for the rains (2nd of June, 1609).¹⁰

On the 15th of October, 1609, Islam Khan resumed his march towards the *Bhati* region. Moving down the Karatoya, he reached Shahzadapur (25 miles north-east of Pabna town), where he halted for sometime. Here the fleet and the artillery joined the land army, and a grand review of the entire force was held after the Id-i-Ramzan festival was over (18th of December, 1609).¹¹

At this stage the Bengal viceroy settled his plan of campaign against Musa Khan, and it is in this connection that Dacca again comes into political prominence. From Balia (six miles south-west of Shahzadapur), Islam Khan sent in advance a strong force of 2,000 matchlockmen, with 20 war-boats, 50 pieces of cannon, and a large quantity of ammunition, under Shaikh Kamal, Tukmak Khan, and Mirak Bahadur Jalayer, to Dacca to reinforce the garrison there, and also to create a diversion in favour of the imperialists. He himself, with the main army and the fleet, proceeded very cautiously to confront the Afghan chief.¹²

Musa Khan made vigorous preparations against the Mughals. He gathered all his followers and their war-equipment, and, with seven hundred war-boats, he marched from his capital Sonargaon towards the fort of Jatrapur, which stood at the entrance of the channel where the Padma (Ganges), the Dhalleswari, and the Ichhamati

10. *Baharistan*, 5a-7b, 9a : Abdul Latif's Diary (*Prabashi*, Aswin, 1326 B.S., pp. 552-53).

11. *Baharistan*, 16a-17b.

12. *Baharistan*, 17b-18b.

met (and where Musa Khan's brother Daud Khan had confronted Raja Man Singh in the spring of 1602). It was an almost impregnable fort, and was strongly garrisoned by an Afghan contingent under Mirza Mumin and Darya Khan. A little above Jatrapur, near the mouth of the three main streams, stood Katsgarh, another stronghold of Musa Khan. The garrison here was now reinforced from the headquarters.

Meanwhile Islam Khan encamped at a convenient place on the left bank of the Padma, a little ahead of Katsgarh, and prepared to attack the enemy post. Musa Khan anticipated him, and led an artillery charge on the imperial entrenchments from a mud fort rapidly made at a strategic point named Dhakjera, 3 miles north-west of Jatrapur. The first attack was repulsed, but more assaults followed, and still no decisive result ensued. At last Musa Khan was defeated and compelled to retreat with heavy loss.

Islam Khan captured Katsgarh, and then directed all his efforts to dislodge the enemy from the strongholds of Dhakjera and Jatrapur. First an assault on the fort of Jatrapur was planned in co-operation with Mirak Bahadur Jalayer, who was summoned to the aid of the *subahdar* from Dacca. Shaikh Kamal, the officer in charge there, promptly sent Mirak Bahadur with twenty boats. The latter moved up the Ichhamati to a strategic point down Jatrapur, where a channel from the Dhalleswari met the Ichhamati ("the mouth of the Kutharuiya" of Mirza Nathan), and he was there joined by the *subahdar*. A night attack on the enemy fort followed. The troops were safely transported across the Ichhamati with the help of the boats brought from Dacca, and then they fell upon the unsuspecting garrison in the early hours of the morning. After a feeble resistance, Musa Khan and his men evacuated the fort.

Islam Khan lost no time, and proceeded to attack the second fortified post of Musa Khan at Dhakjera. It proved to be a more formidable task. Though made of mud, this stockade was almost unassailable, for it had quagmire on three sides, and the river Padma on the fourth. Musa Khan too now offered stubborn defence, but was again defeated and compelled to flee, this time to his capital (c. 9th of June, 1610).¹³

13. *Baharistan*, 18b-23b. Mirza Nathan offers details of the conquest of Jatrapur and Dhakjera which have been omitted here as unnecessary.

Thus after a vigorous campaign lasting about six months (January to June, 1610), Islam Khan succeeded in inflicting a series of defeats on Musa Khan and capturing two of his strongest fortifications. He was now within twenty-five miles of Dacca, and his subsequent plan of campaign brought him direct to that place. Sonargaon, the capital of Musa Khan, must now be stormed, and the Afghan chief totally crushed. Dacca, about nine miles north-west of Sonargaon, furnished the most convenient base of operations. So the Bengal viceroy marched thither, taking necessary measures for securing his line of communications as well as for suppressing internal revolts. Moving down the Ichhamati, Islam Khan first came to Balra (about 24 miles west of Dacca), and then to Kalakopa (about 17 miles south-west of Dacca), where he captured an enemy stockade. Thence he proceeded to Dacca on land, while the fleet first halted at Patharghata (near the confluence of the Ichhamati and the Dhalleswari, about six miles south-west of Dacca), and then reached Dacca through the creek of "Guadhari" (Rennell's Map XII shows a creek near Patharghata, navigable during the rainy season, connecting the Dhalleswari and the Buriganga).

The Bengal viceroy spent the rains (*c.* June-Oct., 1610) at Dacca, and, as soon as the season for campaigning came, sent out some of his competent officers to set up a number of stockades at strategic points around the enemy territory. Though Islam Khan did not actually join fighting, he personally visited the different outposts, and guided the operations at every stage.

Musa Khan fought for the second time with the river Lakhya as his main line of defence. His first task was to thwart the attempt of the Mughals to enmesh him in the net-work of forts, and he fought a number of obstinate engagements in the vicinity of Khizrpur, Kadamrasul, and Katrabau, but lost ground everywhere, and ultimately retired to an island near his capital. One of his prominent officers, at this stage, played the traitor and handed over Sonargaon to the Mughals. Another piece of misfortune was the loss of the important fort of Katrabau, and the fall of its gallant commandant Daud Khan (Musa Khan's brother). The latter was the victim of a night attack made by the imperialists, who appear to have made common cause with the Feringi pirates. Undaunted by the series of misfortunes, Musa Khan made vigorous attempts to seize the

imperial forts of Kadamrasul, and Kodalia (2½ miles south-west of Narayanganj), but failed miserably. At last he thought it prudent to acknowledge the imperial vassalage, and personally submitted to Islam Khan at Dacca (c. June, 1611). The Bengal viceroy, anxious to put down Usman Afghan, pardoned Musa Khan, but kept him at court under strict surveillance.

Before Musa Khan was totally disarmed, Islam Khan received an envoy from a nephew of the Arrakan king Salim Shah, requesting Mughal aid for the recovery of the island of Sandwip from the hands of a Portuguese adventurer named Sebastian Gonzalves. The Arrakan prince proposed to send his sons as hostages to Dacca, and agreed to hold Sandwip as a vassal of the Mughal Emperor.¹⁴

A review of the relations of the Mughals with the Arrakanese and the Portuguese since the days of Raja Man Singh appears to be necessary for realising the significance of the negotiations mentioned above.

The Arrakan king Salim Shah, who had formed an alliance with Kedar Rai, the zamindar of Sripur, and fought against the Mughals under Raja Man Singh in 1602-3, was, soon after that period, involved in quarrels with the Portuguese pirates settled in Syriam and Dianga. These culminated in a general massacre of the colonists at Dianga in 1607.

Sebastian Gonzalves was one of the few Portuguese who escaped from that general massacre, and leaped into fame. He was destined not only to avenge the brutal murder of his countrymen, but also to play a prominent part in the history of Bengal throughout the rule of Islam Khan and even beyond it (1607-16). After living for sometime by plunder on the Arrakan coast, Gonzalves captured the rich island of Sandwip in 1609, and later on seized two other islands at the head of the Bay of Bengal. He then set himself up as an independent ruler, but did not give up his piratical career. Too much power only added to his natural insolence and brutality. In 1611, he committed an act of great treachery by contriving the death of Anaporan, the governor of Chittagong, who had taken refuge in Sandwip, with his family and treasures, after a quarrel with his brother, the Arrakan king.

14. *Baharistan*, 28b-33a, 36a-37a, 41a-41b.

Anaporan's son solicited aid from Islam Khan to avenge the poisoning of his father by Sebastian Gonzalves.

Fully engrossed with the task of subduing Musa Khan, Islam Khan could not render any help to the Arrakan prince against Gonzalves, or otherwise curb his power. The Portuguese adventurer, consequently, continued his plundering activities with impunity, causing untold misery and destitution to thousands of Mughal subjects. The ruthless depredations of Gonzalves and his fellow pirates had, as we shall see later on, an important bearing on the transfer of the capital of the Bengal *subah* to Dacca by Islam Khan.¹⁵

Though the political complications at home prevented Islam Khan from taking immediate steps against the Feringi pirates, he lost no time in preparing the ground for fighting them. Hardly had the second and the final contest with Musa Khan ended, when the Bengal viceroy despatched a strong force to reduce Ananta Manikya, Raja of Bhulua, to submission. The territory of Bhulua on the south-eastern frontier of the Bengal *subah*, was of great strategic importance, for it lay along the route of the Feringi pirates when they came to raid Bengal from Chittagong (see *Fathiyah, Continuation*, pp. 122b-125b : J.A.S.B. 1907). Unable to cope with the invaders, Ananta Manikya evacuated his domain and sought shelter with the neighbouring ruler of Arrakan. Islam Khan made Bhulua, the capital of the Raja, into a strong frontier post and adequately garrisoned it.¹⁶

About the middle of October, 1611, Islam Khan sent a large force against Usman Afghan of Bokainagar. As before, he conducted the campaign from Dacca, moving, when necessary, to Toke, a fortified post on the Brahmaputra (about 42 miles north-east of Dacca, and about 34 miles south of Bokainagar). Usman tried his best to check the advance of the imperialists at every stage, but, after about two months of hard fighting, he was compelled to evacuate Bokainagar and flee across the Laur Hills

15. For the career of Sebastian Gonzalves and his relations with the Arrakan king, see Campos's *History of the Portuguese in Bengal*, 81-87, 154-157, and Phayre's *History of Burma*, 173-76.

16. *Baharistan*, 40b-41a.

to Sylhet (c. early December, 1611), hotly pursued by the victors. Bokainagar, the fortified citadel of Usman, and the neighbouring outposts of Hasanpur and Agarasindar, were promptly occupied and strongly garrisoned.¹⁷

Islam Khan for a time gave up his pursuit of Usman, and utilised the respite in sending a punitive expedition against Raja Pratapaditya of Jessore. The Raja had fallen off from faithful vassalage, and broken his promise of personal service and of military aid in regard to Islam Khan's campaign against Musa Khan. The Jessore expedition conducted from the headquarters at Dacca attained rapid and complete success. The Bengal flotilla defeated the Jessore fleet in two successive battles, causing a heavy loss of men and ships, and, Pratapaditya, anxious to save his territories from total ruin, finally submitted to Islam Khan. He was confined at court, and his kingdom annexed to Mughal domain (c. January, 1612).¹⁸

Sometime after the conquest of Jessore, Islam Khan had to face a serious Magh raid, the first and the only raid recorded of his viceroyalty. Taking advantage of the temporary reduction of the garrisons in the *thanahs* of Sripur and Bhulua, owing to the equipment of the Jessore expeditionary force, a gang of Magh pirates with 300 boats raided the *thanahs* with impunity, and did much damage to life and property. The Bengal viceroy sent speedy reinforcements from Dacca, and the raiders hastily dispersed.¹⁹

Islam Khan next took up the unfinished task of subduing Usman, then strongly entrenched in Sylhet with 'Uhar' as his main stronghold. As Usman proved to be the most persistent and formidable foe of the Mughal government, help from the Royal Court was obtained by the Bengal viceroy in this campaign. But he did not conduct it in person. Islam Khan probably thought it unsafe to leave Dacca for fear of a fresh Magh raid. Usman and his Afghan chiefs in Sylhet fought hard to preserve their

17. *Baharistan*, 42a-46a : *Prabashi*, *Agrahayan*, 1328 B. S. 145-47.

18. *Baharistan*, 49a-57b : *Prabashi*, *Kartick*, 1327 B. S., 1-8 ; Satish Mitra's *Jessore-Khulnar Itihash*, II, 363-395.

19. *Baharistan*, pp. 58b-59a.

independence, but Usman's death on the field of battle (battle of Daulambapur, 2nd March, 1612) totally disorganised his forces, and his brothers were ultimately forced to submit to Islam Khan at Dacca (early in April, 1612).²⁰

The last notable act of the Bengal viceroy was the campaign against Raja Parikshit Narayan of Kamrup (c. Nov. 1613), which resulted in the conquest and annexation of Kamrup to the Mughal empire.²¹

Islam Khan did not long survive this victory in Kamrup. He was suddenly taken ill while hunting in the forests of Bhowal, and died before he could be removed to Dacca (21st August, 1613).²²

The death of Islam Khan is a landmark not only in the history of Mughal rule in Bengal, but also in that of the city of Dacca. The process of consolidation of the authority of the Mughal Emperor against the numerous powerful and independent zamindars, particularly of Lower Bengal, which had started with Raja Man Singh (1594-1605), may now (1613), at the end of nearly twenty eventful years, be said to have been completed. Never again was the imperial authority in Bengal effectively challenged, and the province gradually settled down to peace and order, finally developing into one of the most flourishing provinces of the whole empire. It was during this long process of conciliation and consolidation that the small and insignificant Mughal *thanah* of Dacca gradually grew in military and political importance till it became the official capital of the Bengal *subah*.

A detailed study of the topography of the town of Dacca and of its environs will prove useful for appreciating the reasons of the rapid rise in its fortunes.

So far as soil formation is concerned, Dacca is admirably suited for being the site of a town. It occupies the southernmost point of an elevated stretch of stable red *kunkar* soil, generally of low productivity, but much above the highest flood level of the surrounding rivers. Just south of it is an extensive low-lying tract of rich alluvial soil, but more or less submerged during the rains,

20. *Baharistan*, 62a-74a : *Prabashi*, *Agrahayan*, 1328 B.S., 147-53.

21. *Baharistan*, 105b-118b.

22. *Baharistan*, p. 141b.

and so unfit to be the site of any permanent town. The geographical position of Dacca is also eminently favourable for its political and economic prosperity. A glance at Rennell's Map No. XII will show that Dacca stands on a beautiful and very extensive plain bounded practically on three sides by natural watercourses—by the river Buriganga on the south, the Dolai on the east, and the Pandav river (now extinct, "Neri Creek" of Rennell) on the north and partly on the west. So it can easily be formed into a fortified capital, defendable on land and water. Again, the soil of Dacca and its environs being quite fertile, and the river Buriganga on which it stands being not too powerful or destructive like the Padma, and also navigable throughout the year, Dacca possesses natural facilities for developing into a busy centre of trade and commerce, and it actually did so under the Mughal peace. Above all, from the standpoint of strategy, Dacca occupies an enviable position. It is eminently fit to be used as a military base. Lying at the junction of the Dolai and the Buriganga, Dacca fully commands the numerous water routes which are short cuts from the main channels of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra intersecting south-eastern Bengal, and an effective control of these water routes has always been the one essential condition of success in warfare in that riparian tract.

What appealed most strongly to Raja Man Singh when he made Dacca his headquarters during the protracted conflict with Isa Khan, Usman Afghan, and Kedar Rai (the last one being often aided by the Portuguese and the Arrakanese) during the years 1602-04, was the strategic excellence of the place. Near enough for purposes of an attack on the territories of the most formidable enemies of the Mughal Emperor, Dacca lay far enough for an effective counter-attack, particularly, a surprise attack by night. The strategic importance of Dacca was all the more keenly realised by the Bengal viceroy in relation to another, and a growing menace—that of the Feringi and Magh pirates. Khizrput, by which the pirates used to reach Dacca, lay only about nine miles to the south-east, near the confluence of the Brahmaputra, the Lakhya, and the Buriganga, and a fortified post there, in constant touch with the headquarters at Dacca, would go a long way in meeting the danger.

Very little is known about Man Singh's activities regarding the improvement of Dacca. But it seems clear that as a result of

the long stay (from 1602 onwards) of the Bengal viceroy, a small town sprang up round the imperial outpost, which served as the nucleus of the future capital. Man Singh appears to have taken special care in strengthening the fortifications of the outpost at Dacca, so that it soon came to be recognised as one of the four prominent fortresses of the Bengal *subah*²³.

This was the first step in the rise of Dacca into prominence. The next and the final stage in the political development of the city was reached during the eventful rule of Islam Khan Chishti.

The same exigencies of the military and political situation which had drawn Man Singh to Dacca, attracted Islam Khan as well to the same quarters. According to the definite testimony of the *Baharistan*, the new viceroy put the subjection of Musa Khan, son of Isa Khan, in the forefront of his viceregal programme²⁴, and Dacca certainly offered the most convenient base of operations against that formidable enemy. But Islam Khan's march to Dacca was stubbornly opposed by the Afghan chieftain, and he reached there only after six months of strenuous campaigning, about the middle of June, 1610.

From that time till his death, a little over three years later (August, 1613), political complications compelled Islam Khan to remain at Dacca, and this prolonged stay of the Bengal viceroy had important consequences. The temporary armed camp gradually changed into a permanent civil station. The whole office and the court began to assemble there. Private traders and merchants came in the wake of the viceregal party and settled down at Dacca,

23. *Baharistan*, p. 19b. It is clear from Mirza Nathan's work that long before Islam Khan's entry into Dacca, the place possessed a strong fortrees—in fact one of the four strongest forts in Bengal *subah* (the other three being those of Jajpur, Ghoraghat, and Raj Mahal). F. D. Ascoli, I.C.S., in an article in the *Dacca Review*, 1914, on the Old Dacca, suggests that Dacca grew to be a place of importance in Raja Man Singh's time.

24. Dr. Bhattashali, relying on Abdul Latif's Diary, suggests that Islam Khan had no definite aim in view even when he reached the vicinity of Murshidabad (early January, 1609). But the *Baharistan* definitely says that while still at Raj Mahal, Islam Khan decided to proceed against Musa Khan at the earliest possible opportunity. In fact, the whole itinerary of the Bengal viceroy from Raj Mahal into the heart of Lower Bengal was, to a great extent, shaped by his desire to subdue Musa Khan.

attracted by the great facilities for trade and commerce which it afforded. Islam Khan himself substantially contributed to the development of Dacca. A new fort was built, no vestiges of which now exist, a new palace was constructed, and new roads were laid down, all skirting the river Buriganga. The Bengal viceroy also appears to have improved the defences of his fortified settlement by means of artificial canals. Thus the small town that had originally sprung up around the imperial outpost in the time of Man Singh steadily developed into a large and wealthy city, soon supplanting Raj Mahal from its proud position of the capital of the Bengal *subah*²⁵.

In the light of the foregoing remarks, much of the fiction that has gathered round the so called foundation of Dacca, and the nature, manner, cause, and time of the transfer of the capital of the Bengal *subah* to that place by Islam Khan may be cleared.

First, with regard to the foundation of Dacca. Dr. Bhattasali has already pointed out that Dacca was never founded by Islam Khan. The town is much older, and can boast of at least a few inscriptions of the pre-Mughal period.

As regards the nature of the transfer of the capital to Dacca, it was in a sense unique. It was not the result of any premeditated scheme, on the part of Islam Khan, complete in itself, and carried into effect all at once, but it was rather a piecemeal act—the result of exigencies of circumstances—in which the hand of destiny was more potent than any human hand. In fact, it was quite unlike Man Singh's deliberate transfer of the seat of government from Tanda to Raj Mahal, or, coming to more modern times, the transfer of the capital of India from Calcutta to Delhi by the British Government in 1911. The gradual transfer of the Mughal provincial capital to Dacca rather finds a parallel in very recent times in the transference first of the governor's residence and court, and of some important offices, and then of the rest of them from Allahabad to Lucknow by the United Provinces Government.

25. *Baharistan*, p. 60b mentions "New Dacca" and "Old Dacca", in connection with the events of January, 1612, obviously distinguishing Islam Khan's new settlement from the old town of Raja Man Singh's time.

The very nature of the transfer determined the manner in which it was to be effected. As the whole thing was piecemeal in character, so it was accomplished by stages. At first owing to military necessities, the viceregal camp and court only moved to Dacca. Then for purposes of political administration, the entire governmental offices and the staff were gradually removed from Raj Mahal to that place. So from a military settlement Dacca became the seat of the civil government, and finally emerged as the official capital of the Bengal *subah*.

As the transfer of the capital was a slow and almost imperceptible process, there was an air of informality about it from start to finish. Nothing is on record to show that there was ever a ceremonial or formal foundation of the new capital, or even any official inauguration of the same when the old capital was finally abandoned.

This explains why there is no particular reference to this important political event in the Persian chronicles of Jahangir's reign. To contemporary historians, it was nothing but the acknowledgment of an accomplished fact—the logical consummation of a process started much earlier—and hence not worthy of any special mention. Even the change in the name of the city (from Dacca to Jahangirnagar), consequent on a change in its political status, is not particularly noted by contemporary writers, not even by Mirza Nathan, who is otherwise so punctilious in his narrative.

Different causes of the change of the capital have been mentioned by different historians. While the *Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri* suggests that Islam Khan came to Dacca to reduce that zamindars of the vicinity, particularly Usman Afghan, to subjection, the *Baharistan* emphasises that the subjugation of Musa Khan was the dominant desire of Islam Khan from the beginning of his viceroyalty, and this, more than anything else, drew him to Dacca.

Stewart and Wise, amongst others, on the other hand, fix upon the suppression of the Magh and Portuguese raids into south-eastern Bengal as the main motive of Islam Khan's removal of the seat of government to Dacca.

A third group of historians, notably Hunter, Sayyid Aulac Husain (Notes on the Antiquities of Dacca, 1880), and Beni Prasad

have tried to effect a compromise between the two extreme views outlined above, and they have suggested that the necessity of putting down the Afghan zamindars as also the Magh and Feringi pirates combined to induce Islam Khan to abandon Raj Mahal and settle down at Dacca.

Dr. Bhattashali, on his part, totally ignores the Portuguese pirates, and says that it was mainly to subdue Usman and the other powerful zamindars of Bengal that Islam Khan ultimately made Dacca his headquarters.

We may be permitted to state that the transfer of the capital to Dacca was, in a sense, an inevitable occurrence, and it was due to circumstances almost beyond Islam Khan's control. Man Singh's activities had already shaped the future of Dacca, and Islam Khan could not help farther advancing its cause. Dacca soon developed into a city of considerable military and political importance, and a busy centre of trade and industries.

Raj Mahal, the old capital, on the other hand, was at this time fast losing all its attractions. A change in the course of the Ganges, on which the fortified capital city stood, appears to have already set in by which the river finally receded nearly a *kos*, making the city inaccessible to war-boats and unfit for defence on land and water, and also unsuited for trade and commerce.²⁶

It is no wonder, therefore, that Dacca, with its excellent geographical and strategic advantages, should attract Islam Khan, particularly when he was extremely anxious to subdue the powerful rebellious zamindars in its neighbourhood as early as practicable. The evidence of the *Tuzuk* and the *Baharistan* taken together leads to the irresistible conclusion that the subjection of Musa Khan, the head of the so-called "Baro-Bhuiyas" of that time, and of

26. *Baharistan*, p. 293a states in connection with the rebel prince Shah Jahan's engagement with the Bengal viceroy Ibrahim Khan Fathjang, c. April, 1624, at Raj Mahal, that the Ganges had receded nearly a *kos* from the fortified citadel. Tavernier (Crook's edition, Vol. 1, p. 102) definitely suggests (1666) that the change in the course of the river, involving a loss of trade facilities, was a prominent cause of Islam Khan's removal to Dacca. The process of change which appears to have been completed by the year 1624 must have started much earlier.

Usman Afghan of Bokainagar, formed the main plank of Islam Khan's military programme, and, for the successful completion of that ambitious programme, Raj Mahal was totally unsuitable, while Dacca was most favourably situated. The Afghan menace in general may thus be held to have been a powerful factor in bringing about the change of capital.

Another important motive of Islam Khan's removal to Dacca appears to have been the suppression of the Magh and Feringi pirates. The collective testimony of the *Akbarnamah*, the *Baharistan*, and the *Fathiyah, Continuation*, leaves no room for doubt that the Magh and Feringi raids into south-eastern Bengal, extending as far as Dacca, began at least as early as the days of Raja Man Singh. The *Akbarnamah* refers to the 'Magh' king's incursions into Bengal in the year 1603, and the *Baharistan* (p. 36 b) probably alludes to the same incident by locating a ruined fort near Khizrpur as built by the 'Maghs' during the time of Man Singh. The *Fathiyah, Continuation*, gives minute details of the Magh and Feringi raiders, and, particularly, of their routes of attack, in Jahangir's reign. We learn that the Mughal governors used to encamp at Khizrpur every winter to prevent Magh raids on Dacca, and that the pirates coming from Chittagong passed by Bhulua. The *Baharistan* offers useful information regarding the activities of the Magh and Feringi pirates, particularly those of Sebastian Gonzalves, during the time of Islam Khan, incidentally throwing light on the way in which they influenced the choice of a new capital. Though the depredations of Gonzalves had reached their climax, political complications at home prevented the Bengal viceroy from utilising an opportunity of subduing him which came by his way early in 1611. He, however, lost no time in securing a base of operations against him and his associates by taking possession of the territory of Bhulua on the south-eastern frontier (c. autumn of 1611). The conquest of Bhulua brought Islam Khan into direct and more deadly conflict with the 'Maghs,' and a serious raid on the *thanahs* of Sripur and Bhulua soon followed (c. Jan., 1612). The testimony of the *Baharistan* regarding these raids may be said to be corroborated by the Portuguese historian Bocarro. He refers particularly to the piratical career of Gonzalves, adding that in 1610, he made an alliance with his habitual enemy, the

Arrakan king, against the Mughals, and launched a daring raid on the frontier tract of Bhulua and Luckipur.²⁷

These piratical inroads, frequent in their sequence and fierce in their intensity, considerably influenced Islam Khan's choice of a new capital. The Bengal viceroy must find out a place from which a close watch on the routes usually taken by the pirates could be kept, and fortified outposts at strategic points conveniently set up and efficiently maintained. Dacca appeared to be admirably suited for all these purposes. Khizrpur, Sripur, Sangramgarh ("18 *kos* from Dacca and 21 *kos* from Sripur," near the confluence of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra), and Bhulua, all of which lay along the routes of the pirates, could be effectively watched only from Dacca, and from this place alone could the strategic posts set up at those points be easily reached, and speedy reinforcement in the case of a sudden attack conveniently despatched.

Thus it seems clear that a quite a number of factors operated in regard to the change of capital from Raj Mahal to Dacca during the rule of Islam Khan. The personal factors were supplied by Raja Man Singh and Islam Khan. The former really set the stage for the drama of Dacca's rise into fame, and Islam Khan filled the leading role. Nature also aided Dacca. A change in the course of the Ganges, leading to the loss of the strategic and commercial importance of Raj Mahal, the existing capital, weighted the scale in favour of Dacca, endowed by nature with considerable geographical and strategic advantages.²⁸

27. There is some confusion regarding the date of this event. According to Bocarro, the earliest Portuguese chronicler regarding the history of this period, it occurred in 1610, and, following him, Faria Y Souza, and, after him again, Stewart, Hunter, Phyare, and others all suggest that this combined attack took place during the rule of Islam Khan in 1610. Stewart goes on further to say that this raid primarily induced Islam Khan to change the seat of the government to Dacca. The *Baharistan*, on the other hand, places this event definitely in 1614, during the viceroyalty of Qasim Khan, and it seems to be more accurate. Whatever may have been the date of this occurrence, the existence of the danger of the Magh and Feringi raids throughout the viceroyalty of Islam Khan cannot be doubted, and Stewart's theory, taken generally, appears to be a reasonable one.

28. Bowrey (Countries Round the Bay of Bengal, 1669-79, H. S. Publications, p. 14) says in relation to Mir Jumla's times that Dacca is a stronger and fairer city than Raj Mahal, the ancient metropolis.

The immediate factors which made the transfer of the capital inevitable were, however, the ambitious object of Islam Khan to finally subdue the rebellious zamindars of south-eastern Bengal, notably Musa Khan and Usman Afghan, as also his earnest desire to combat the ever-increasing inroads of the Arrakan king and the Magh and Feringi pirates of Chittagong.

Now to come to the precise date when the transfer of capital was effected by Islam Khan. Here again we tread on controversial ground. The Persian chroniclers do not expressly suggest any date, and this has apparently given rise to much speculation on the part of modern historians.

According to Stewart, Islam Khan was appointed governor of Bengal in 1606, and 'the first act of Islam Khan's authority was the removal of the seat of government from Raj Mahal to the city of Dacca.' Though the date suggested by Stewart, 1608, has been accepted by a good many writers—Wise, Campos, Bradley Birt, Beni Prasad, Jatindra Roy, and others—it does not at all appear to be a probable one. The contemporary Persian chroniclers as a whole do not at all support Stewart's theory that the transfer of capital was the first official act of Islam Khan. Abdul Latif's *Diary* and the *Baharistan*, on the other hand, definitely suggest that the first act of Islam Khan's viceroyalty was his elaborate preparation for marching from Raj Mahal down the Ganges into Lower Bengal in order to subdue the rebellious zamindars there. Further, the *Baharistan* makes it clear that Islam Khan reached Dacca only early in June, 1610, and this was more than two years after his assumption of office at Raj Mahal.

A second date is 1612 A. D., suggested by Gladwin, and it is four years later than the date advocated by Stewart. According to Gladwin, it was after the victory over Usman Afghan in 1612 that Islam Khan removed the seat of his government to Dacca. Gladwin's views find favour with a number of historians, including Taylor, Hunter, Sayyid Aulad Husain, and Wright (*Indian Museum Catalogue*, Vol. III. Introduction, p. LI).

In the absence of any direct evidence offered either by the original authorities in Persian or by the coins and inscriptions extant, it is indeed difficult to offer any conclusive opinion on this point. But internal evidence mainly furnished by the text of the

Tuzuk, the *Baharistan*, and the *Iqbalnamah*, together with what may be termed 'the circumstantial evidence,' may be said to favour the date suggested by Gladwin as the most probable date of the final transfer of the capital to Dacca, though the initial stage of the transfer appears to have been reached two years earlier.

The *Tuzuk* (R.+B. Vol I. pp. 209, 214 : E. & D. VI. pp. 328, 330) first mentions Dacca as plainly 'Dacca' in connection with the beginning of Islam Khan's viceroyalty in Bengal, and subsequently as 'Jahangirnagar' in regard to the triumphant entry of Shujaat Khan into Dacca after his decisive victory over Usman Afghan in Sylhet (c. April, 1612). The different context in which one and the same place appears under different names seems to be significant, and it lends colour to the view that Dacca was formally acknowledged to be the capital of the Bengal *subah*, in place of Raj Mahal, only after the final defeat of Usman Afghan.

The *Iqbalnamah* (Bibliotheca Indica Series, pp. 61-64) and the *Maasir-ul Umara* (Bib. Ind. Series, Vol. II. Islam Khan Chisti, pp. 630-33) do not refer to 'Dacca' at all, but names the place only once as 'Jahangirnagar', after the manner of the *Tuzuk*, in connection with Shujaat Khan's visit there after the final subjugation of Usman.

The *Baharistan*, however, throws new light on this point. The text consistently refers to Dacca simply as 'Dacca' till Islam Khan's march into it after the capture of Musa Khan's strongholds of Jatrapur and Dhakjera early in June, 1610. Immediately after this event, Dacca is named for the first time as 'Jahangirnagar alias Dacca (30b)'. Henceforward the new name is frequently used by Mirza Nathan (the author of the *Baharistan*) to denote the new viceregal capital (31b, 43a, 44a, 56b, 57b, 58a, 62b, 64b etc.), the plain epithet 'Dacca' being only occasionally applied in the same connection (58b, 60b.) This change of name of Dacca into 'Jahangirnagar' immediately after the events of 1610 was apparently informal, yet it was a significant act, and from that time Dacca was marked out to be the future capital of the Bengal *subah*.

So far for the textual evidence. The 'circumstantial evidence' may be gathered from the political history of Bengal during the period of Islam Khan's viceroyalty, and it seems to confirm the evidence deducible from the Persian texts. A survey of the

political history brings forward two definite stages in the viceregal career of Islam Khan, the first stage ending with his victory over Musa Khan at Jatrapur and Dhakjera, followed by his triumphant entry into Dacca (the second fight of Musa Khan being only a desperate attempt to win a cause already lost), and the second one ending with the final defeat and death of Usman Afghan in Sylhet, and the history of the transfer of the viceregal capital appears to have passed through two corresponding stages.

The events of June, 1610, marked the beginning of the process of change of headquarters, which reached its culmination a little less than two years after, *c.* April, 1612. The fall of Usman Afghan, the last redoubtable enemy of the Mughal peace, presented the Bengal viceroy with the most favourable opportunity for taking the final step forward in the inauguration of the new capital. Islam Khan now formally renamed the capital city 'Jahangirnagar' in honour of the reigning sovereign, and this act received official recognition as we find it in the *Tuzuk* and the *Iqbalnamah*.

It is interesting to note the evidence of coins in connection with the date of the transfer of capital. Though Jahangirnagar became the official capital of the Bengal *subah* in the seventh regnal year of Jahangir (1021 A.H.), it was not till the beginning of the twelfth regnal year (1026 A.H.) that coins were minted from the new capital. No coins of any earlier year have yet been discovered, and 'the date on a coin attributed to the second year in London Museum Coin Catalogue (P. 154) is obviously uncertain.'²⁹

The reason of this long delay in the issue of coins seems to have been the sudden death of the Bengal viceroy Islam Khan which was followed by a period of political squabble and administrative disorder under his brother Qasim Khan. The latter was removed from office in 1617, and an abler and more experienced and tactful person named Ibrahim Khan Fathjang appointed in his place. He restored peace and order in the country and signalled the advent of better times by issuing coins for the first time from the new capital.

29. Indian Museum Coin Catalogue, Vol. III, Introduction, PLI Coin No. 674 : Catalogue of Coins, Punjab Museum, P. LXVIII.

The new name given to Dacca after it had attained the dignity of a capital city does not appear to have received the recognition it deserved. The old name continued to find favour with the common people, and the new name Jahangirnagar was confined only to official annals, just as the name Akbarnagar given to Raj Mahal, the former capital, was not acceptable to the general people, and survived only in the official chronicles of Akbar's reign³⁰.

The establishment of the capital of the Bengal *subah* at Dacca by Islam Khan Chishti was a red-letter day in the annals of this city. For nearly a century, with a short break about the middle, Dacca continued to hold its proud position of the provincial metropolis. During this time there was an all round development of the city. It extended in territory, its trade and industries developed, its commerce flourished, and it also attracted a large foreign population. Sir Thomas Roe, Father Manrique, Tavernier, Bowrey, (Haklyut Society publication, P. 149-50 footnote), Thevenot (Part III, P. 68), and others testify to the wealth and general prosperity of Dacca in the seventeenth century. In short, the history of Dacca of that period forms an important chapter of the history of Mughal Bengal which will form the subject of future investigations.

30. See Abdul Latif's Bihar Diary (J. B. O. R. S. 1909. pp. 601-03) for the naming of Raj Mahal ; as regards Dacca, Sir Thomas Roe, 1615-1619 (Foster's Edition, Vol II. p. 538), mentions only 'Dekaka' (Dacca), and Stephen Cacella (Early Jesuit Travellers in C. Asia, pp. 122-123), 1626, refers simply to 'Dacca', and Herbert's Travels, 1638, p. 77, to 'Daeck' (Dacca); Manrique (Bengal, Past and Present, 1916 pp. 2-3) and Tavernier (Crook's edition p. 102) have simply 'Dacca'.

THE DATE OF THE KHAḌGA DYNASTY

PRAMODE LAL PAUL, M.A.

Research Student, Dacca University.

The date of the Khaḍga kings of Samatāṭa can only be determined by a study of the palaeography of the Āshrafpur plates, but on this matter the opinions of scholars differ very widely. Mr. G. M. Laskar¹ who edited these plates was of opinion that the script looks generally older than that used in those of the Pāla and Sena kings of Bengal, while Mr. R. D. Banerjee² assigned it to the 9th-10th century A. D. Dr. R. C. Majumdar³, Dr. R. G. Basak⁴, and Dr. N. K. Bhattasali⁵ believe that the Khaḍga inscriptions should not be assigned to a date posterior to the beginning of the 8th century A. D. Mr. R. D. Banerjee promised to discuss the palaeography of the Āshrafpur plates minutely but evidently never actually did it. The subject, therefore, needs a detailed examination and a comparison of the script with that of other inscriptions is inevitably necessary in order to fix approximately the date of the Khaḍgas.

A comparison with the Khālimpur plate of the 32nd regnal year of the second Pāla emperor Dharmapāla brings out the following points in clear prominence :—

(a) In Āshrafpur the initial *ā* is formed by joining a comma-shaped curve at the lower extremity of the right vertical of *a*. In Khālimpur *ā* is formed by joining an *ākāra*, parallel to the vertical line of *a*, which is undoubtedly a later palaeographical characteristic.

-
1. Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. 1, No. 6, p. 85.
 2. The Pālas of Bengal, Ibid. Vol. V. No. 3, p. 67; Bāṅglāra Itihasa p. 233.
 3. J. A. S. B. 1923, p. 375.
 4. History of North-Eastern India, p. 203.
 5. J. A. S. B. 1914, p. 85.

(b) The contrast is equally striking in the case of *gha*. This letter in Āshrafpur retains the archaic tripartite form while in Khālimpur there is a strong bipartite tendency, though it is not yet complete. The Āshrafpur form is to be rarely found in the records posterior to the 7th century A. D.

(c) *Ja* of Āshrafpur is less advanced than that of Khālimpur. In the former three horizontal lines are clearly noticeable; the central one is somewhat elongated vertically in some cases and the lowermost one is slanting. Mr. R. D. Banerjee⁶ finds no distinction between Khālimpur *ja* and the modern Bengali form of the letter. The uppermost horizontal line has become the serif, the vertical elongation of the central one is complete and the lowermost one consists of two curves.

(d) The contrast is also remarkable in case of *ṭa*. In Āshrafpur *ṭa* retains its circular form. In Khālimpur the right curve has formed a straight line and in the left part of the letter after a short straight downward elongation from the top-stroke a full-fledged semi-circle is attached to it. In all subsequent epigraphs this form is to be found. The right curve of *ṭa* in Āshrafpur has not formed a vertical line.

(e) Two forms of *la* are to be found in Āshrafpur. —(1) in most cases the curve in the left is joined by a short line almost at right angles with the vertical line but (2) this letter in the words *pālanīya* (l. 21, Plate B), *lolam* (Ibid) and *Sālivardhaka* (l. 16 Ibid) consists of the curve and the vertical line only. The second form resembles the Eastern *la* of the Gupta period.

As regards Mr. R. D. Banerjee's opinion that palaeographically the Āshrafpur plates are to be assigned to the 10th century A. D., it may be observed that the main characteristics of the script of that century are conspicuous by absense. In Āshrafpur plates the vanishing tendency of the base line of *ṇa*, elongation of the verticals in the downward direction and the serifs on the upper part of *pa*, *ma* *sa*, and *ṣa* are not to be found.

The script of the Deulbāḍī Sarvāṇī Image inscription⁷ of Queen Prabhāvatī of Devakhaḍga is akin to that of the Āshrafpur

6. Origin of the Bengali Script, p. 53.

7. Ep. Ind. Vol. XVII. p. 357.

plates. The characters of these records bear close resemblance to those of the Āphsaḍ inscription of Ādityasena and Deo-Baranark inscription of Jīvitagupta II of the Later Gupta dynasty. *Na*, *sa* and *śa* of Āshrafpur are somewhat different from those of Āphsaḍ. The Āphsaḍ *na* is akin to modern Nāgarī form of the letter and the loop of *sa* in Āshrafpur is angular. *Śa* of Khālimpur and Āphsaḍ is similar and seems to be earlier than that of Āshrafpur. But in the Keśab-praśasti of the 26th year of Dharmapāla one form⁸ is similar to that of Āshrafpur and this form is also to be found in the Deo-Baranark inscription. This form of *śa* is discontinued for a long time but reappears in the 11th century records.

From a general look of the Khālimpur and Āshrafpur plates it is evident that the scribe of the latter was not an expert in his art like that of the former and the letters have not been so finely incised and nicely arranged—a fact which possibly led some scholars to assign them to so late a date as the 10th century. When particular letters of the Āshrafpur plates are compared with those of other plates, it can be confidently said that their date cannot be very much distant from that of the Āphsaḍ and Deo-Baranark inscriptions of the Later Gupta dynasty which are to be placed respectively in the latter half and the beginning of the 8th century A. D.

Lastly, a passing notice may be made of the fact that the characters of the Āphsaḍ and Āshrafpur plates differ considerably from what Bühler called the acute-angled type. Fleet called the characters of the Āphsaḍ inscription the Kuṭila variety of Magadha—a term which Bühler and Kielhorn wanted to avoid in the palaeographic terminology. The scribe of the Āphsaḍ inscription was an inhabitant of Gauḍa and it is the beginning of the variety from which has ensued the Proto-Bengali type of the 11th century. Strictly speaking, this variety should be regarded as the fore-runner of the Proto-Bengali form.

8. Three forms of *śa* have been used in this inscription.

THE DEATH OF HĪMŪ

SUKUMAR RAY, M.A.

Research Scholar, Dacca University.

§ 1. *Importance of the 'Hīmū incident.'*

The precise manner of Hīmū's death is one of the great controversial points of Indian history. The incident by itself would not have been considered a subject of any importance and would not have at all deserved the notice of historians but for the fact that it reveals Akbar as he was during his early years when his liberal and philosophic mind had not yet developed. The deliberate slaughter of a wounded infidel, though condemned by the enlightened opinion of the twentieth century, was sanctioned by the Holy Church and justified by the age and such a jihād was the aspiration of many a pious Muslim. It must be a matter of great significance if Akbar, who was barely fourteen years of age, refused in that age to slay a fallen foe who was an infidel and to gain the title of ghāzī which added glory to his name and majesty to his throne. If he did so, the humane, tolerant and cosmopolitan son of Humāyūn was born, not made. If it was not so, if Akbar killed Hīmū as others would have killed him, without feeling any hesitation, this higher aspect of his character must have developed afterwards due to his maturer judgment, wisdom of years, environment and policy. The 'Hīmū incident' is thus of importance as it places the Akbar of early years in due relation to the Akbar of maturer age.

§ 2. *Mr. Vincent Smith on the subject.*

Until recently the accepted theory has been that Akbar, out of magnanimity to a fallen foe, refused to kill Hīmū even though he was an infidel, and Bairām Khān put an end to his life. From Dow who wrote his 'History of Hindostan' in the latter half of the eighteenth century to Von Noer who wrote at the end of the

nineteenth every author who wrote on the subject accepted this version. Mr. Vincent Smith was the first scholar to raise doubt in this matter and reject the accepted version. Nineteen years back he contributed an article on this subject to the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland and he concluded in that article "that the current story about Akbar's magnanimity on the occasion of Hēmū's execution is a fiction made up at court to suit the later view of the emperor's character, and that the truth is that the young prince obeyed his guardian and smote off Hēmū's head with a scimitar, thereby securing the title of Ghāzī, which he assumed immediately."¹ His conclusion is based upon the work of Ahmad Yādgār and Fragmentum Historiae Indicae in de Laet, both of which say that Akbar himself struck Hīmū and killed him and do not mention anything as regards his hesitation to execute a fallen foe. As regards the reason why he accepts the account of these two and rejects the statement of Abu-l Fazl, Badāunī and others, Mr. Smith says, "I am of opinion that all probability is in favour of the version of the Hēmū incident as related by Ahmad Yādgār and de Laet." He sums up as follows the argument in his "Akbar the Great Mogul" which he published shortly after: "The official story, that a magnanimous sentiment of unwillingness to strike a helpless prisoner already half-dead compelled him to refuse to obey his guardian's instructions, seems to be the late invention of courtly flatterers, and is opposed to the clear statements of Ahmad Yādgār and the Dutch writer, van den Broecke, as well as to the probabilities of the case."²

§ 3. *Mr. Vincent Smith's conclusion based on insufficient evidence.*

As regards 'the probabilities of the case' on which Mr. Smith lays stress, men will differ. Mr. Smith says that Akbar 'had been reared among scenes of violence and bloodshed by Muhammadans who regarded the killing of a Hindu infidel as a highly meritorious

1. J. R. A. S. July, 1916. p. 534.

2. V. A. Smith—Akbar the Great Mogul, p. 39. Second Edition, Oxford, 1919.

act' and in such a position he would not have felt any scruples. Secondly, it is not probable that 'a boy of 14 would set up his private opinion against that of his guardian and all the by-standers.' As regards the first point, we have not enough evidence to prove that Akbar in his earlier years shared the bigotry and hard-heartedness of his age. On the other hand his subsequent actions might not unprobably lead one to believe that Akbar would hesitate to cut off the head of a dying captive. As regards the second point, it is not quite improbable that Akbar could have differed with his guardian. Though Akbar was only fourteen he was quite conscious of his position and Bairām found in him from the very beginning not a docile ward but a prince who looked on him as a servant. A year after the battle of Panipat Bairām Khān says to Muhammad Khān Ataga : 'His Majesty occasionally treats me with disfavour.'³ The way in which Akbar managed, four years later, to dismiss the great minister makes it quite probable that he could have differed with Bairām when the latter asked him to slay Hīmū and earn the title of ghāzī. In any way 'the probabilities of the case' cannot be regarded as a very weighty argument on either side.

Let us, therefore, examine the two authorities on which Mr. Smith based his conclusion—*Tārīkh-i-Salāṭīn-i-Afāghana* and *Fragmentum Historiae Indicae*. Ahmad Yādgār, who is the author of the first, wrote at least 58 years after the event for he cites *Ma'dan-i-Akhhār-i-Ahmadī* which was composed in 1614 A. D. (1028 A. H.). In his preface he describes himself 'as an old servant of the Sur kings' and says that he wrote the work by order of Dāūd Shāh. So he was quite at liberty to speak the truth even against Akbar. We have no reason to doubt the statement of Ahmad Yādgār that he served the Sūr Kings but he must have served them in his very early years. If we take him to be an old man of 75 at the time of the composition of his work, he would be 17 at the time of Hīmū's death. Two facts should be noted when we consider the authority of Ahmad Yādgār. First, he wrote his work long after the incident ; secondly, as a servant of the Sūr kings he had not any facility to have a first hand knowledge of the incident which took place at the Mughal camp. So much regarding Ahmad Yādgār.

3. Akbar Nāma, Beveridge, vol. II. p. 94.

As to the *Fragmentum Historiae Indicae*, Pelsart who is its real author came to India in December 1620 as an officer of the Dutch East India Company and 'was forthwith sent to Agra, where he remained until the end of 1627, rising to the position of senior factor'.⁴ Pieter van den Broecke with whose name the Fragment is associated arrived in Surat towards the end of 1620 as the Director of what was officially called the 'Western Quarters', comprising North and West India, Persia and Arabia.⁵ Therefore neither Pelsart nor Van den Broecke can be regarded as a good authority for the early history of Akbar's reign.

It is on the basis of authorities like Ahmad Yādgar and Pelsart that Mr. Vincent Smith rejected the version of Badāunī, supported by 'the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī* and many other histories'. Naturally one cannot but hesitate to accept his views and feel that his conclusion was based on insufficient evidence. Further we may here point out that Mr. Smith did not consult the two really contemporary authorities for the incident—Bāyazīd Bīyāt and Muhammad 'Arif Qandahārī. The work of Bāyazīd is too well-known to have been neglected but he consulted only the synopsis, published by Mr. Beveridge in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1898, which unfortunately omits the portion relating to Hīmū's death. The *Tārīkh-i-Akbarī* of 'Arif Qandahārī is less known but Mr. Beveridge notified its existence at the Rāmpur State Library in the same journal some seven years before Mr. Smith wrote that article. Several other untranslated authorities of the period, which are important for this purpose, were not consulted by Mr. Vincent Smith. So his conclusion about the 'Hīmū incident' cannot be regarded as the final decision of the question.

§ 4. *The authorities for the incident—contemporary and nearly contemporary.*

We may divide the authorities for the 'Hīmū incident' into four groups. To the first group belong those works which were written under the patronage of the Mughal court during the reign

4. Moreland and Geyl's *Jahāngīr's India*, p. ix, xv.

5. *Ibid*, p. x; Hoyland and Banerjee—De Laet's *Empire of the great Mogol*, p. iv.

of Akbar. These are Tārikh-i-Akbari of 'Ārif Qandahārī, Mukhtasar of Bāyazīd Biyāt, Akbar Nāma of Abu-l Fazl, Tabaqāt-i-Akbari of Nizām-ud-Dīn Ahmad, Muntakhab-ut-Tawārikh of 'Abd-ul Qādir Badāunī, Tārikh-i-Haqqī of Shaikh 'Abd-ul Haq, Tārikh-i-Alfī of Ja'far Beg Āsaf Khān, Majāmi'-ul-Akhhbār of Muhammad Sharif-ul-Husaini known as Waqū'i, Rauzat-ut-Tāhirin of Tāhir Muhammad Hasan 'Imād-ud-Dīn, Ahsan-ut-Tawārikh of Hasan bin Muhammad. To the second group belong those works which were composed under the patronage of the Mughal court during the first half of Jahāngīr's reign and which are of some importance for the history of Akbar. They are Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī of 'Abd-ul Bāqī Nahāvandī, Iqbāl Nāma of Mu'tamad Khān, Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh of Nūr-ul-Haq, Tawārikh-i-Akbar Nāma of Shaikh Ilāhdād Faizī Sirhindī, Makhzan-i-Afghānī of Khwāja Ni'matullah. We may also add the Tūzūk-i-Jahāngīrī, written by the emperor himself. To the third group belong those works which were composed during the reign of Akbar but written independently of the Mughal court. These are Wāqīāt-i-Mushtāqī of Shaikh Rizqullah and Haft Iqlīm of Amīn Ahmad Rāzī. To the fourth group belong all those works which were composed during Jahāngīr's reign but written independently of the Mughal court. They are Tārikh-i-Firishta of Muhammad Qāsim Hindū Shāh known as Firishta, Ma'dan-i-Akhhbār-i-Ahmadī of Ahmad bin Bahbal, Tārikh-i-Salātīn-i-Afāghana of Ahmad Yādgar, Tārikh-i-Dāūdī of 'Abdullah, Bodleian Ms. No. 101—an anonymous work composed during Jahāngīr's reign. We may add a fifth group consisting of works of later historians from which we obtain the 17th and 18th century view of the incident. These are Mirāt-ul-'Ālam by Muhammad Bakhtāwar Khān, or more properly, Muhammad Baqā, Lubb-ut-Tawārikh by Rāi Brindāban, Khulāsāt-ut-Tawārikh by Sujān Rāi Bhandārī, Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb by Khāfi Khān, Tazkirat-us-salātīn-i-Chaghta by Muhammad Hādī and Mirāt-i-āftāb-numā by 'Abdur-Rahmān Shāhnawāz Khān.

§ 5. *Five versions of the 'Hīmū incident'.*

From a study of these authorities we find five versions of the death of Hīmū. And these five versions are those of Abu-l

Fazl, Nizām-ud-Dīn, Firishta, 'Ārif Qandahārī and the emperor Jahāngīr.

We begin with Abu-l Fazl. We might as well call Abu-l Fazl's version the version of Ja'far Beg Āsaf Khān, but as Abu-l Fazl is more well-known, we prefer to name it so. Abu-l Fazl has the following on the 'Hīmū incident':

"Bairām Khān Khān Khānān begged H. M. the Shāhīnshāh to slay with this own sacred hand this stock of sedition, and to acquire merit by a holy combat. That lord of wisdom and master of sages... replied.....that his lofty spirit did not permit him to slay a captive and that it seemed to him that in the justice-hall of the Only One there was nothing meritorious in such an act. Though simple loyalists importuned and pressed him, the Shāhīnshāh showed himself more and more averse to the proceeding.....At last Bairām Khān Khān Khānān when he perceived that H. M. was not inclined to take his view, withdrew from the attempt, and under the influence of hereditary beliefs which take their place in men from imitation of fathers and teachers, himself became engaged in the acquisition of this fancied merit, and with his sword cleansed the world from the contamination of his existence."⁶

It is to be noticed that Abu-l Fazl who had imbibed the spirit of *sulh-i-kul* was fully conscious of the guilt in slaying a fallen foe even though he were an infidel. He makes the following comment on the death of Hīmū: "Would that H. M. had come out of his veil and given attention to the matter! or that there had been some far-sighted master of wisdom in that court, so that they might have kept Hēmū in prison and made him desirous of serving the threshold of fortune."⁷

A somewhat different version is offered by Nizām-ud-Dīn Ahmad whose *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* is of great importance for the history of Akbar's reign.

"Shāh Qulī Khān considering this as the most prized of the spoil brought that elephant, along with others which he had carried

6. Akbar Nāma-Beveridge, II., p. 65-66. A. S. B. Text, p. 41-42.

7. Ibid. p. 66-67.

from the battlefield, to the royal camp and presented them before the king. Khān Khānān Bairām Khān [then] killed Hīmū with his own hand.”⁸

Nizām-ud-Dīn, unlike Abu-l Fazl, does not refer to Bairām Khān’s begging prince Akbar to slay Hīmū with his own hand or anything about Akbar’s refusal.

We find the third version in Firishta.

“When Shāh Qulī Khān brought Hīmū to the presence of the emperor who was following [the army] at a distance of 2 or 3 kurohs [4 to 6 miles], Bairām Khān represented to him that if he would slay this infidel, at war with Islam, with sword with the intention of holy war, the higher jihād⁹ would be performed. The emperor touched Hīmū’s head with the tip of his sword and acquired the title of ghāzī. Then Bairām Khān with his own hand beheaded him and sent his head to Kābul and his body to Delhi.”¹⁰

Though Firishta does not refer to Akbar’s refusal, Akbar, according to him, hesitated to kill Hīmū for he merely touched his sword on Hīmū’s head. A second point to be noted is that Akbar approved of Bairām Khān’s advice to become a ghāzī and he did not differ with his contemporaries in recognizing jihād as a meritorious act.

We find the fourth version in the account of the incident by Muhammad ‘Ārif Qandahārī in the *Tārīkh-i-Akbarī*. The work is very rare. Sir Henry Elliot could not find any copy of the work in Indian and European libraries. One copy is now extant—that in the Rāmpur state Library.¹¹ ‘Ārif’s version is of great importance as one of a contemporary writer ; for none of the historians mentioned above and no other writer of Akbar’s reign excepting Bāyazīd Bīyāt

8. *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, A. S. B. Text, p. 132 and Lucknow Text p. 245.

9. *Jihād-i-Akbar* means war against one’s lusts ; *Jihād-i-Asghar* war against infidels. The meaning is Akbar would perform the higher kind of Jihād by killing Hīmū.

10. Firishta, p. 246, Lucknow Text.

11. I have used Sir J. N. Sarkār’s copy, made from the Rāmpur Ms.

were contemporary with the event under discussion. We have the following account in 'Ārif's history :

در اثنای دار و گیر تیری بر چشم هیموی لعین آمده بر دست
شاه قلی خان محرم گرفتار آمده..... چون هیمون را بدرگاه
آوردند... خاقان اکبر اول شمشیر بار زدند چون شمشیر بار رسانیدند
ملقب بغازی شدند و اندک رمقی که مانده بود خانخانان محمد بیرم خان
شمشیری زده از را بدار البرار فرستاد *¹²

"In the midst of the conflict an arrow pierced the eye of the accursed Himū and he fell a captive in the hands of Shāh Qulī Mahram.....When they brought Himū to the royal presence the emperor Akbar first struck him with sword and when the sword touched him he gained the title of Ghāzī. And for the little breath that remained (in him), Khān Khānān Muhammad Bairām Khān struck him with sword and sent him to hell."

There is this much in common between 'Ārif and Firishta that both of them make Akbar regard jihād as a meritorious act and willing to obtain the title of Ghāzī. Firishta differs with 'Ārif in Akbar's magnanimity which is implied in his version. In 'Ārif Akbar does not object to kill Himū but as he is unable to finish him he is helped by Bairām Khān.

We may add a fifth version—that of the emperor Jahāngīr in his *Tūzūk-i-Jahāngīrī*.

"A number of men immediately conveyed Hemū as he was to the king (Akbar). Bairām Khān represented that it would be proper if the king with his own hand should strike the infidel with a sword, so that obtaining the reward of a ghāzī (warrior of the Faith) he might use this title on the imperial farmans. The king answered, 'I have cut him in pieces before this' and explained: 'One day, in Kabul, I was copying a picture in presence of Khwāja 'Abdu-ṣ Ṣamad Shīrīn Qalam, when a form appeared from my brush, the parts of which were separate and divided from each other. One of those near asked 'Whose picture is this?' It came

12. Sir J. N. Sarkār's Ms. p. 75.

to my tongue to say that it was the likeness of Hemū'. Not defiling his hand with his (Hemū's) blood, he told one of his servants to cut off his head."¹³

Jahāngīr's version differs from 'Ārif's in this that Akbar had Hīmū killed by one of his servants while 'Ārif says Akbar himself struck him. In neither do we find that Akbar refused to kill Hīmū out of magnanimity and to earn the title of ghāzī.

The problem before us is to find out what version records the truth. In order to arrive at truth or, I should say, approximation of truth we should examine the five versions in the light of all other available evidences on the subject.

§ 6. *Authorities in favour of Abu-l Fazl.*

Among historians who composed their works during the reign of Akbar Ja'far Beg Āsaf Khān and 'Abd-ul-Qādir Badā'uni are the only two who agree with Abu-l Fazl about 'the Hīmū incident'. The Tārīkh-i-Alfi was finished in 1588-89 A. D. (997 A. H.), some seven or eight years before the composition of Akbar Nāma which was completed in 1596 A. D. (1004 A. H.). It was written by order of Akbar himself who 'directed its compilation by several learned men.' The fourth volume which records events from 694 A. H. to 997 A. H. was the work of Ja'far Beg Āsaf Khān, a distinguished officer of Akbar. In it we find what we may call royal or official version of the incident. The Tārīkh-i-Alfi has the following on the death of Hīmū :

شاه قلی خان محرم از مساعدت بخت خوشحال گشته فیل و فیلبان هیمورا
از میان معرکه بکنار آورده عازم اردو شد و دیگر امرا برسم تعاقب روان
شدند و چندان از مخالفان بقتل آوردند و شاه قلی خان هیمورا
بدرگاه آورد و آن حضرت بعد از لوازم شکرگذاری در مقام نوازش امرا در
آمد و هر یک فراخور سعی خود نتیجه یافته از اقران ممتاز گشتند و خان
خانان استدعا نمود که قتل هیمو که مسیح ثواب دارین است بتحریریک

¹³. Tūzūk-i-Jahāngīrī. Rogers and Beveridge, Vol. 1. p. 39-40. Lucknow Text, p. 18-19.

شمشیر خاصه اگر بفعل آید خوب است آنحضرت در جواب فرمود که
مباشرت قتل از بحسب ظاهر لایق نمی نماید رفی الحقیقه پیش
ازین بچندین سال از مقتول ماست¹⁴..... اکنون دیگر باره دست
بخون از نمی آلایم..... القصه بپیرام خان خانان بقتل هیمون ا
غازیان شد سر هیمو بکابل و بدنش در دهلی از دروازه آریختند¹⁵*

“Elated at the favour of fortune Shāh Qulī Khān brought Hīmū's elephant and driver aside from the battlefield and proceeded to the (royal) camp. Other nobles went in pursuit of [the enemy] and killed so many of the enemiesAnd Shāh Qulī Khān brought Hīmū to the king. The king after thanksgiving [to God] bestowed favours on his nobles, each of whom obtained reward according to his endeavour and became distinguished among his equals. The Khān Khānān begged that it would be very good if the killing of Hīmū, which would produce reward both in this life and in the next, be performed by the king himself. The king replied, 'It does not seem proper to undertake to kill him outwardly. In fact before this—some years back—he was killed by me..... Now why should I defile my hand with his blood again?'..... In short Bairām Khān Khān Khānān became a ghāzi by killing Hīmū and had his head hung from the gate at Kābul and his body at Delhi.”

The strength of Abu-l Fazl's version lies in the fact that it is supported by Badāunī. Badāunī's work is of supreme importance for the history of Akbar's reign as the account of a royal official who did not bask in the sunshine of royal favour and who saw in the emperor the bitter enemy of his faith. From Badāunī one can expect facts which the official and court historians will not reveal. Though he

14. Here follows the story of Akbar's killing Hīmū in picture which has been related also by Abu-l Fazl and Jahāngīr.

15. British Museum Ms. Or. 465. fol. 593 a-b. Also India office Ms. 3293, fol. 433 a-b. The copies differ in a few words which, however, do not affect the sense. I have adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the most correct.

differs occasionally with Abu-l Fazl, he agrees with the latter on the 'Hīmū incident'. His account is as follows :

"So they brought him as he was to the camp. And Shaikh Gadā-i Kambōh and the others, said to the Emperor, 'Since this is your Majesty's first war against the infidels, you should flesh your sword in this unbeliever, for such an act would have great reward.' But the Emperor replied : 'Why should I strike him now that he is already as good as dead ? If sensation and activity were left in him, I would do so.' Then the Khān Khānān was the first to strike his sword into him, as an act of religious warfare, and following his example, Gadā-i Shaikh and the others, deliberately made an end of him."¹⁶

In two essential points Badāuni agrees with Abu-l Fazl—Akbar's magnanimity in refusing to slay a dying foe and to obtain the glory of killing an infidel. He differs with Abu-l Fazl in minor details e.g. Shaikh Gadā'i and others followed Bairām and finished Hīmū.

Several works written from the Court circle during the reign of Jahāngir corroborate Abu-l Fazl's version. The most important of them is Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī of 'Abd-ul Bāqī Nahāvandī. Though primarily a biography of Khān Khānān 'Abd-ur-Rahīm, it gives a summary account of Indian history. The Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī has the following on the death of Hīmū :

"The Khān Khānān begged the emperor to slay Hīmū with his own hand and earn the reward of a war upon infidels. His noble mind refused to kill a prisoner. When the Khān Khānān realised that the emperor would not be inclined to do this, he himself undertook to acquire this fancied reward and cleared the world of the impurity of his existence."¹⁷

Again in the second volume we find :

"When Hīmū was brought to the presence of the emperor, Bairām Khān begged him to punish Hīmū with his own hand. As

16. Muntakhab-ut-Tawārikh—Lowe., Vol. II. p. 9. Text Vol. II. p 16.

17. Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī. Vol. I. p. 652, A. S. B. Text,

the emperor hesitated a little the Khān Khānān himself undertook to acquire this fancied merit and cleared the world of the contamination of this impure one.”¹⁸

Shaikh Ilāhdād Faizī Sirhindī, the author of *Tawārīkh-i-Akbar Nāma* and Mu'tamad Khān, the author of *Iqbāl-nama-i-Jahāngīrī* agree with Abu-l Fazl or rather follow him.

Faizī Sirhindī relates the Hīmū incident as follows :

درین دهاده تیرمی برچشم همون ناپکار برگشته روزگار رسید و همچو
بخت از پس سر او گذشت و بر فیلی که سوار بود با فیلان دیگر بردست
شاه قلیخان محرم گرفتار آمد و از نظر اشرف گذرانید خانخانان التماس
کرد که آنحضرت بوسیله غذا حصول مراتب ثواب و جزا نموده او را
او را بدست اقدس گذرانند پسندیده همت نفرمودند که او را سیر و مرده
است بمرده چه تیغ آلائیم خانخانان بدست خود تیغ انداخت و کار او
تمام کرده بجهنم فرستاد *¹⁹

“From this side an arrow struck the eye of the vile and wretched Hīmū and according to his fate pierced through his head. Mounted on the elephant, Hīmū along with other elephants, was captured by Shāh Qulī Khān Mahram who carried him to the presence of the king. The Khān Khānān begged that, in order to acquire the reward of a war upon infidels, the king should strike him first. The nobility of his mind could not approve of this and [he said] ‘He is a captive and as good as dead. Why should I defile my sword with a dead one?’ The Khān Khānān struck him with his own hand and finished him and sent him to hell.”

The *Iqbāl Nāma* gives the following account :

بیرام خان التماس نمود که بندگان حضرت خود بقصد ثواب شمشیر
بر این مقهور سیاه بخت اندازد آن حضرت را همت رخصت نداد که تیغ

18. Ibid—Vol. II. p. 31-32.

19. *Tawārīkh-i-Akbar Nāma* fol. 9a, Ms. Or. 169, British Museum. Also fol. 6a-b, India Office Ms, No. 289.

جهان ستانرا آن نیم جان ناپاک آلایش بخشد و هر چند در این التماس مبالغه را غراق بکار رفت اصلاً توجه نفرمودند آخر خانانان خود در تحصیل این ثواب پیش دستی نموده... بتیغ خرنریز جهانرا از رجود گناه آلود پاک ساخت *²⁰

"Bairām Khān begged the emperor that in order to obtain reward he should himself strike this wretched vanquished with sword. His noble mind did not allow him to defile his world-conquering sword with that half-dead impure one. Although Bairām Khān insisted on this, the emperor did not show any inclination at all. At last the Khān Khānān himself proceeded to acquire this reward and by his sharp sword cleansed the world from his [Hīmū's] sinful existence."

Of the historical works, written independently of the Mughal court, only the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī* agrees with Abu-l Fazl. It was written during Jahāngīr's reign by one 'Abdullah. 'Abdullah says :

مقارن آنحال شاه قلی خان محرم فیل هرای را از میدان به غنیمت برآورد مهادت فیل مذکور گفت مرا مکش که هیمر بر همین فیل است شاه قلی خان این را غنیمت دانسته بنظر اکبر پادشاه درآورد بیرم خان عرض نمود که چون این فتح ازل است و پاکفارسرت یافته اند به نیت غزا این کافر را بدست خود بکشند اکبر پادشاه فرمود که این خرد مرده است بر مرده چه تیغ آلایم غرض هر صورت هیمر کشته شد *²¹

"Just about this time Shāh Qulī Khān Mahram captured the elephant Hawāi from the battlefield by way of spoil. The driver of the afore-said elephant said : 'Do not kill me ; Hīmū is on this very elephant'. Shāh Qulī Khān considering this as a grand opportunity took [Hīmū] to the presence of the emperor Akbar. Bairām Khān begged that as this was his first victory and as he had overcome the infidels, the emperor should kill this infidel with his own hand in order to perform a religious warfare. The emperor Akbar said, 'He

20. *Iqbāl Nāma*, Vol. II, fol. 9a. Ms. No. 66, Būhār Library.

21. *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*—fol. 123b-124a. Ms. Or. 197, British Museum.

is as good as dead ; why should I defile my sword by killing a dead one.' Hīmū was killed in any case."

§ 7. *Authorities in favour of Nizām-ud-Dīn.*

Let us now consider the second version—that of Nizām-ud-Dīn. The Ahsan-ut-Tawārikh of Hasan bin Muhammad is the only work composed in the reign of Akbar which agrees with the version of Nizām-ud-Dīn. Hasan began his work towards the close of Akbar's reign and completed it in the early part of Jahāngīr's. His account is as follows :

بدست شاه قلی خان محرم که در بالای فیل تیری بر چشمش رسیده
بود گرفتار شد در رکاب سعادت انتساب که به پنج گروهی جنگ گاه رسیده
بود آورده بدست بیرام خان به قتل رسید *²²

"Hīmū, whose eye was pierced by an arrow while on his elephant, was captured by Shāh Qulī Mahram and was taken before His Majesty who had reached within ten miles [five kurohs] of the battle-field and was killed by Bairām Khān."

Of the works composed during Jahāngīr's reign, the Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh and Bodleian Ms. No. 101 corroborate Nizām-ud-Dīn Ahmad. The author of Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh is Shaikh Nūr-ul-Haq who composed it under the patronage of Shaikh Farīd Bokharī, an officer of note in Jahāngīr's government. The other work is anonymous. Nūr-ul-Haq says :

غیلبی که همون بر سوار بود چون فیلبان از کشته شده همون
بر بالای آن در جوکندی بود بر میگشت اتفاقاً شاه قلی خان محرم
محمربانی فیل دیگری از معرکه غنیمت آورده بود از نظر اشرف بگذرانید
و خانخانان بیرام خان آن ناپاک بی باک را بدست خود کشته بجهنم
رستاد *²³

22. Ahsan-ut Tawārikh, fol. 513b. Ms. Or 1649. British Museum.

23. Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh, fol. 98b. Ms. No. 290. India O₁ ce.

"The driver of the elephant, upon which Hīmū was seated in the howdah, having been killed, the elephant was itself wandering. By chance Shāh Qulī Khān, the most intimate with [the emperor], who had carried other elephants as spoil from the battlefield, brought it along with them to the presence of the emperor. Then Khān Khānān Bairām Khān killed that impudent impure one with his own hand and sent him to hell."²⁴

Beddian. Ms. 101 agrees with *Ahsan-ut-Tawārikh* word by word :

بدست شاه قلی خان مکرم که در بالای فیل تیری برچشمش
رسیده بود گرفتار به رکاب سعادت انتساب که به پنج کورهی جنگ گاه
رسیده بود آورده بدست بیرام خان بقتل رسید *²⁵

"Hīmū, who was lying on the elephant, wounded in his eye by an arrow, was captured by Shāh Qulī Khān Mahram and presented to His Majesty who had reached within ten miles [five kurohs] of the battlefield and was then put to death by Bairām Khān."

§ 8. *The third and fifth versions and the views of later historians.*

The third version, that of Firishta, is Firishta's own and is not corroborated by any other historian. Similarly, the fifth version, that of the emperor Jahāngīr, is also unsupported by any other

24. Nūr-ul-Haq seems to be contradictory when he relates Hīmū's death under the reign of 'Adli on fol. 95a.

'در پانی پت بدست بندگان حضرت شاهنشاهی کشته گردید'
unless we translate the sentence as—'Hīmū was put to death at Panipat by the servants of the king.' The phrase *بندگان حضرت* usually means the king or His Majesty and Nūr-ul-Haq uses it in the next page to mean 'the king' in connection with Akbar's enthronement (Vide Ms. fol. 95b). It is also quite probable that if he had meant 'servants of the court,' he would have inserted some such words like *بعضی از* or *یکی از* before *بندگان حضرت* as Dr. Shādāni of the Department of Persian, suggests.

25. fol. 323a.

historian (though the story of Hīmū's picture we find related in the Akbar Nāma and Tārīkh-i-Alfī).²⁶

Before we discuss the fourth version, we would refer to the views of later historians on the 'Hīmū incident'. The *Mirāt-ul-Ālam*, which was composed in 1683 A.D. (1094 A.H.) by Muhammad Baqā, follows Abu-l Fazl and states that Akbar refused to slay Hīmū who was almost dead and Bairām Khān killed him.²⁷

The *Khulāsāt-ut-Tawārīkh* which was composed in 1696 (1107 A.H.) by Sujān Rāi Bhandārī also supports the version of Abu-l Fazl. Sujān Rāi says that as Akbar refused to strike Hīmū who was a captive Bairām Khān put him to death.

بعضی امرا التماس نمود که آنحضرت از دست مبارک بقصد غزار
حصول ثواب شمشیر بر این مقهور اندازند فرمودند که تیغ خود بخون
اسیری آلوده کردن نه از این مردی است..... در آن وقت بیرم خان
نظر بر مرضی مقدس داشته بعرض رسانید..... و پیش دستی
نموده بمصام خون اشام تن او را از بارسبک ساخت و عرصه هندوستان را
ازخس و خاشاک وجود عصیان آلودش پاک گردانید سر او را بکا بل رتن
او را در دهلی فرستاد *²⁸

The *Tazkirat-us-salātīn-i-Chaghta*, written by Muhammad Hādī, sometime after 1724 A.D. also accepts Abu-l Fazl's version and states that Akbar out of nobility and loftiness of soul refused to slay Hīmū whereupon Bairām Khān killed him.

بجناب حضرت التماس نمود که بطریق شگون حضرت بدست
مبارک آن کافر بدکیش را بیاسانند آن حضرت از را لا مفشی و
بزرگنهادی قبول این معنی نکردند هر چند مقربان بساط حضرت

26. Akbar Nāma—Beveridge, Vol. II, p. 67; Tārīkh-i-Alfī. British Museum Ms. Or. 465. fol. 593a-b. India Office Ms. 3293. fol. 433a-b.

27. *Mirāt-ul-Ālam*. fol. 158a. Ms. No. 11. Būhār Library.

28. *Khulāsāt-ut-Tawārīkh*. fol. 265a-b. Ms. No. 32. A. S. B. Curzon Collection.

باری عزم مکالمه کردند زبان بجراب نکشاد خانانان بشمشیر آبدار
سر آن فتنه انگیز را بخاک هلاک انداخته د عالم را از شور و شر او
نجات داد *²⁹

The famous historian Khāfi Khān whose *Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb* was written about 1732-33 A.D. (1145 A.H.) also virtually agrees with Abu-l Fazl, though he does not directly mention Akbar's refusal and magnanimity.³⁰

We thus find that the later historians of note accepted the view of Abu-l Fazl or more properly the official version.

It may be noted here that the *Tārīkh-i-Haqqī* of Shaikh 'Abd-ul Haq which was composed during Akbar's reign, does not mention anything about Hīmū's death. It does not record the events of Akbar's reign but stops at his accession. The continuation in the Bodleian Ms. Ousely 59. is most probably by a different and later author. The *Wāqī'āt-i-Mushtāqī* which was composed during the reign of Akbar by Shaikh Rizqullah who was not connected with the Court, avoids the question of Hīmū's death by stating merely that "the bastard, vanquished Hīmū was captured and killed":

”و هیمون مزند مقهورا سیر و گرفتار گردید و بقتل رسید“³¹

§ 9. Importance of the version of *Ārif Qandahārī*.

Let us now examine the fourth version, that of *Ārif Qandahārī*. We may estimate the importance of *Ārif Qandahārī* if we consider the following points. First, *Ārif Qandahārī* was a contemporary authority. Secondly, written as it was before the standard histories of Akbar's reign, it presents an independent version of the history of that illustrious monarch. Thirdly, while we can ascribe motives in the case of many historians for making false statement about the 'Hīmū incident' we cannot reasonably ascribe similar motive in his case.

29. *Tazkirat-us-salāṭīn-i-Chagta*. A. S. B. Ms. No. 168. fol. 106a.

30. *Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb*. Vol. 1. A. S. B. Text. p. 134.

31. *Wāqī'āt-i-Mushtāqī*. British Museum Ms. 11633, fol. 78b-79a.

None of the authorities, mentioned above, can be called contemporary. Even Ja'far Beg Āsaf Khān, Abu-l Fazl, Nizām-ud-Dīn and Badāunī were not contemporary with the event. They joined the service of Akbar a considerable time after the death of Hīmū.³² Muḥammad 'Ārif Qandahārī may be said to have been contemporary with the event. He was the steward of Bairām Khān and we find him present in the royal camp when Kāmraṇ was blinded.³³ 'Ārif was with Bairām Khān in Gujarāt at the time of the latter's assassination. That he followed his master in his retirement proves his great attachment to Bairām Khān and it is quite reasonable to think that 'Ārif had been in Bairām's service while the Mughals were fighting with Hīmū. Even if he had not been present in the field, it cannot be doubted he had excellent means to gather accurate information about the death of Hīmū. This makes 'Ārif Qandahārī the best authority for the incident.

Secondly, 'Ārif's history was written before the standard histories of the reign—those of Abu-l Fazl, Nizām-ud-Dīn and Badāunī—were composed. It will not be too much to say that almost all histories written in Persian during the Mughal period follow them at least for Akbar's reign. 'Ārif's is the only history that is independent of Nizām-ud-Dīn and Abu-l Fazl and his account of Akbar's reign, though rather brief, shows a marked originality and a refreshing contrast to other works which inevitably follow the track of the Akbar Nāma and the Tabaqāt.

Thirdly, in the case of Abu-l Fazl, Nizām-ud-Dīn, and Āsaf Khān we can reasonably ascribe motive for making false statement. Abu-l Fazl fully recognises the futility of killing an infidel prisoner and no one who has perused his Akbar Nāma can doubt that he is ever anxious to hide the dark spot in his emperor's reputation.

32. Ja'far Beg came to India in 1577. Abu-l Fazl was born in 1551 and was introduced at court in his seventeenth year. In the twenty-ninth year of Akbar's reign Nizām-ud-Dīn was appointed to the office of bakhshi of Gujarāt. Badāunī, though he joined Akbar's service early in life, did not associate himself with court from the first year of his reign.

33. Mukhtasar—fol. 64b. Ms. No. 223. India office. Also Akbar Nāma, Beveridge, Vol. I., p. 607.

The *Tārīkh-i-Alfi* of Ja'far Beg, which was written under royal supervision, calls for no remark. As regards *Nizām-ud-Dīn* it may be said that, though he was himself an orthodox Mussalman and would have recognized the merit of a jihād, he fully knew as a courtier that Akbar himself would very much dislike to do such an act at the time when he began to compose his history. But *Badāunī* is not open to this explanation. He is not a servile courtier but shows the other side of the medal. As a bigoted Sunni *Badāunī* would have very much liked the emperor to kill an infidel and earn the title of *ghāzī*. It is said his work was kept secret; if so he would not have been afraid of giving the true account, however much it might have been to the displeasure of Akbar. We have therefore to regard *Badāunī* as a reliable authority for the 'Hīmū incident.'

As regards 'Ārif Qandahārī, it may be said that in order to relieve his master, *Bairām Khān*, of the responsibility for the execution, he shifted it to prince Akbar. 'Ārif wrote the work as a servant of Akbar and he gave the title of his work after the name of the Emperor.³⁴ We cannot say whether 'Ārif was a bigoted Mussalman like *Badāunī* or a liberal Mulsim like *Abu-l Fazl*. But it is sure that when 'Ārif wrote his history, Akbar could not have thought of obtaining heavenly reward by slaying an infidel.

The reasons for which we reject the authority of *Abu-l Fazl*, *Nizām-ud-Dīn* and 'Āsaf Khān are also applicable to almost all those historians who support them. That none of them were contemporary authorities need not be repeated. Of the histories, supporting *Abu-l Fazl*, the *Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī* is a work of great importance, written under the patronage of *Khān Khānān* 'Abd-ur Rahīm and Faizī. It may be argued that its author would not have intentionally put the guilt of Hīmū's execution on the shoulder of his patron's father for 'Abd-ul-Bāqī is like *Abu-l Fazl* conscious of the uselessness of acquiring merit by slaying infidel. It is true that the *Ma'āsir-i Rahīmī* shows bias in favour of *Bairām Khān* but not at the cost of the emperor Akbar. It was written under the patronage of Faizī and 'Abd-ur-Rahīm who were loyal servants of

34. Vide *Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī*. Vol. II., p. 1.

the court. The other supporters of Abu-l Fazl are Shaikh Ilāhdād Faizī Sirhindī and Mu'tamad Khān. Both were written under the patronage of the court—Sirhindī's patron was Shaikh Farīd Bokharī, a distinguished officer of Akbar and Jahāngīr; both of them confess that they based their work on Abu-l Fazl; none of them had the facilities to obtain accurate knowledge of the incident. The *Tārīkh-i Dāūdī* is the only work, written independently of the Mughal court, that agrees with Abu-l Fazl. The fact that it was written from outside court-influence is important, but as we know nothing of the author beyond his name, we cannot say what opportunities and equipments he had to write the early history of Akbar's reign. We know, however, that his work must have been composed after the accession of the emperor Jahāngīr.

The supporters of Nizām-ud-Dīn's version are only three in number: the *Ahsan-ut-Tawārikh*, the *Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh* and the Bodleian Ms. Ousely. 59. The author of *Ahsan-ut-Tawārikh* came from Persia to India in the reign of Akbar and obtained different offices under the government. It is regarded as an important authority on Eastern history and Briggs quotes from it on many occasions. Though his authorities are many and good, a perusal of the Indian section of his work leads us to believe that he based it on the *Tabaqāt* of Nizām-ud-Dīn whom he exactly follows on this incident, and that he adds very little to the stock of our knowledge of the period. Besides, the reasons for which we cannot accept the version of Nizām-ud-Dīn, are also applicable to him.

The *Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh* is of course a far more valuable authority. Besides his personal knowledge the author obtained much valuable information from his father, 'Abd-ul Haq, who himself is the author of an historical work known as *Tārīkh-i-Haqqī* about which we have said before. Nūr-ul Haq wrote his work under the patronage of Shaikh Farīd Bokharī, a distinguished noble of Akbar and Jahāngīr, while his father's appreciation of Akbar towards the end of his work places him in the rank of Abu-l Fazl as a panegyrist. Besides, the perusal of *Zubdat-ut-Tawārikh* dealing with the history of Humāyūn and the early part of Akbar's reign, must convince one that Nūr-ul-Haq owed to Nizām-ud-Dīn more than he acknowledged. His father, 'Abd-ul-Haq who was preparing the history of Akbar's

reign and from whom he must have gathered information, was born in 958 A.H., some five years before the death of Hīmū. For all these reasons Nūr-ul-Haq cannot be regarded as a very good authority for the incident under discussion.

The value of the Bodleian Ms. Ousely. 59. it is difficult to estimate. If it is the same as the Ms. D. 275 of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, as Mr. Ivanow suggests, it has little value for the latter was composed in 1655 A.D. (1065 A.H.). But even if we accept the opinion of Dr. Sachau that it was written during Jahāngīr's reign, we cannot appraise its worth properly for we do not know anything either about the author or of his sources and equipments.

As for Firishta, he agrees with Abu-l Fazl ; for in his account Akbar's magnanimity is implied, though he differs with him in slight detail *e.g.* Akbar's touching the sword on Hīmū's head. The fact that Firishta wrote from outside court-influence is of importance. But he was a southerner residing at Bijāpūr—far removed from northern affairs and he is not at all regarded as an original authority for the history of Akbar. His version, which is unsupported by any other historian, seems to me to be a modified account of 'Ārif Qandahārī whom he cites as one of his authorities—modified so as to suit the truly humane character of Akbar.

The emperor Jahāngīr's version is also unsupported by any other authority. Just as Firishta in spirit agrees with Abu-l Fazl, so Jahāngīr in spirit agrees with 'Ārif. In his version there is no mention of Akbar's magnanimity ; Akbar did not kill Hīmū as he had already killed him in picture. So he ordered one of his servants to do this for him. The Tārikh-i-Alfī agrees with Jahāngīr in the story of Hīmū's picture but in the former Akbar's magnanimity is implied and Bairām alone is responsible for the execution.

Thus from an examination of all the authorities we find that 'Ārif Qandahārī is the most reliable authority for the 'Hīmū incident'. There is only one among all the historians about whom we have discussed just now—who can be regarded as a trustworthy authority and whose account cannot be dismissed as that of a courtly flatterer. He is Badāūnī and even Badāūnī also is inferior to 'Ārif in one point—he was not strictly speaking contemporary with the event.

§ 10. *Authorities corroborating 'Ārif Qandahārī's version.*

The problem now may be simplified thus : whether we should accept 'Ārif Qandahārī's version or Badā'uni's ? And it can be easily solved for 'Ārif is supported by the only other authority whom we may regard as contemporary. He is Bāyazīd Biyāt whose memoirs cover the reigns of Humāyūn as well as Akbar. When the incident took place Bāyazīd was at Kābul in the service of Mun'im Khān. After the execution of Hīmū, his head was sent to Mun'im Khān at Quruqsai (Afghanistan) and Mun'im Khān sent it on to Bāyazīd at Kābul with instructions to hang it from the Iron Gate.³⁵ Bāyazīd gives a rather long account of the arrival of Hīmū's head at Kābul. Besides, four years later, Bāyazīd returned to India and joined the royal camp during Bairām Khān's rebellion.³⁶ Bāyazīd thus had opportunity and means to know about the 'Hīmū incident' even from eye-witnesses. Bāyazīd says,

و همان زمان او را دست گیر کرده و این خبر را به بندگان حضرت
شاه قلی محرم که در آن زمان ملازم نواب بیوم خان بود رسانید و متعاقب
آن کافر را به پای فیل حضرت رسانیدند و بندگان حضرت فرمودند که اگر
مسلمان می شوی از سرخون تومی گذریم و آن کافر حرام زاده باسلام
در نیامد آخر الامر بندگان حضرت شمشیری برو زدند و از آن تارینخ
جلال الدین محمد اکبر بادشاه غازی می نویسند..... و سران
حرام زاده را بکابل فرستادند *³⁷

"Immediately he (Hīmū) was taken captive and this was reported to the king by Shāh Qulī Mahram, who was at that time in the service of Bairām Khān. After this that infidel was taken at the foot of the king's elephant and the king said : 'If you become a Mussalman, I shall spare your life.' But that bastard infidel did not embrace Islam. At last the king struck him with a sword and since that date he has been called Jalāl-ud-Dīn

35. Mukhtasar fol. 89a.

36. Ibid. fol. 93b—94a.

37. Ibid fol. 88b—89a.

Muhammad Akbar Pādshāh Ghāzī..... The head of that vile (infidel) was sent to Kābul.”

It must be admitted that no other historian, if he is not ‘Ārif Qandahārī who was in Bairām Khān’s service at that time, had better opportunity to obtain accurate knowledge of the event than Bāyazīd Biyāt. There is no doubt that Bāyazīd was a bigoted Mussalman—the destruction of a temple at Benares and erection of a mosque on its site might be given as a typical example.³⁸ It may be said that in order to add the glory of jihād to his patron-emperor’s name, Bāyazīd in his memoirs makes Akbar kill Hīmū with his own hand and gain the title of ghāzī. But it should be marked that Bāyazīd wrote his Mukhtasar in 1590-91 A. D. (999 A. H.) in obedience to royal order—at a time when Akbar would not have at all agreed to do such an act. Bāyazīd would not have dared to write what must have been disliked by the emperor, had it not been the bare truth. Bāyazīd was a Bakāwāl Bēgī or steward of the kitchen under Humāyūn. He had not the learning and knowledge of Abu-l Fazl and Nizām-ud-Dīn—his is essentially a plain man’s narrative; and it is from plain narratives like those of Jauhar and Bāyazīd rather than those of the learned scholars who colour events after their own fashion, that we are more likely to obtain glimpse of truth. It is significant that Abu-l Fazl who largely draws upon Bāyazīd differs with him on this incident. On the whole we do not see why Bāyazīd should have written a false version of the death of Hīmū and even if he would have liked to do it, he could not have done so as a royal servant. Besides, as Bāyazīd informs us, out of the nine copies of his work, two went into Abu-l Fazl’s and one into the Imperial Library.

The joint testimony of Bāyazīd and ‘Ārif Qandahārī is sufficient to overthrow the versions of Abu-l Fazl, Nizām-ud-Dīn and all other historians who support them, and is certainly more weighty and valuable than that of Badāunī. Even if we had no other authority to support them, we should have accepted the version of ‘Ārif and Bāyazīd—but we have several other authorities who corroborate their account and enable us with more certainty to reject the

38. Mukhtasar—fol. 131b.

version of Badāunī. We shall deal with them in chronological order :

(1) The first is Muhammad Sharīf Waqū'i, the author of Majāmi'-ul-Akhhār. A short account of the author is given in Haft-Iqlīm.³⁹ He first attached himself to Shihāb-ud-Dīn Ahmad Khān and after his death (1590-91 A. D., 999 A. H.) to Sipāhsālār 'Abd-ur-Rahīm Khān Khānān. Later on he entered the service of Akbar. Therefore he had some opportunities to gather information about the history of Akbar's reign. Muhammad Sharīf exactly agrees with Bāyazīd and like Bāyazīd does not refer to Bairām Khān's part in the execution of Hīmū :

هیمون در اثنای جنگ بزخم تیری از پای در آمد و سپاه هندی
و افغان بطریق دود از آتش گریزان گشتند و از ستیزه آویز روی بر تافته بر
هزیمت و خلاق یشمار کشته شد و هموی بضرب تیغ المنس فعل حضرت اعلی
بدرک اسفل رفت و بعد ازین لفظ غازی بر القاب همایون افزوده شده *⁴⁰

"In the midst of the conflict Hīmū fell down, being wounded by an arrow and the Hindusthani and the Afghan forces separated from one another like smoke from fire and turned their face from the conflict and fled. Numerous men were killed. And Hīmū went to the lowest pit of hell, being struck by His Majesty's sword which acted like diamond."

(2) The next work that corroborates this view is Rauzat-ut-Tāhīrīn. Its author, Tāhīr Muhammad, began to compose his history in 1602-3 (1011 A. H.) and completed it four years later after the accession of Jahāngīr. He was already more than twenty years at Akbar's court when he began his work, for he says he entered Akbar's service in the year 1579 A.D. (987 A. H.). Tāhīr Muhammad gives the following account :

شاه قلی معمر خود را بهمون که بر عمارتی فیل سوار بود رسانیده
اورا بدرگاه جهان پناه آورد و بیرام خان التماس نمود که بندگان حضرت به

39. Fol. 320b-321a, Ms. No. 283, A. S. B.

40. Majāmi'-ul-Akhhār, fol. 399b, Ms. No. 119, India Office.

نہیں غزا شمشیر بروحوالہ کردند و چون اردو • علی بیک منزل دہلی
رسید مولانا پیر محمد شروانی حسب الحکم بقصبہ ریواری رفتہ
و اسوال او را بقید ضبط آوردہ بدرگاہ خلایق پندہ باز گشت *⁴¹

“Shāh Qulī Mahram himself approached Hīmū who was seated on the howdah of the elephant and brought him to the presence of the king. In accordance with the request of Bairām Khān the king fleshed his sword on Hīmū by way of religious warfare.”

(3) One important work, composed during Akbar's reign but written independently of the Mughal court, supports this view. It is the *Haft-Iqlīm* of Amīn Ahmad Rāzī, completed in 1593-94 A.D. (1002 A.H.). It is a geographical as well as biographical encyclopaedia. Amīn Rāzī was a native of Ray. “The author's first cousin, *Khawājā* Gīyas Beg (the father of the famous Nūr Jahān Begam) rose to a position of great influence under Akbar, and was subsequently distinguished as *I'timād-ud-Daula*, the all powerful wazīr of Jahāngīr. Writing of Agra, Amīn showers praises upon Akbar of whom he speaks in the present tense, and various indications point to his having visited India while the great emperor was still on the throne. He seems to have made good use of this opportunity for collecting information about the country of which he gives fairly detailed account from the earliest times down to Akbar.”⁴² Amīn Rāzī's account is important as offering an independent view of the affair. For the Indian portion of the history he relies mainly upon the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* but he differs with Nizām-ud-Dīn about the ‘Hīmū incident.’ Amīn Rāzī writes the following while narrating the career of Hīmū under ‘Adlī's reign :

41. *Rauzat-ut-Tāhīrīn*. fol. 347a. Ms. No. 8. Būhār Library. There is a gap in the British Museum Ms. Or. 168. concerning the early period of Akbar's reign. So the above paragraph relating Hīmū's death does not occur there.

42. Preface to *Haft Iqlīm*, A. S. B. Text, Fascicle, I, p. iii, by Khān Sāhib Maulavi ‘Abd-ul Muqtadīr.

و همو در دهلی با قردی بیگ خان که ارنیز در سلک اولیای
دولت قاهره انتظام داشت جنگ کرده غالب آمد و آخر بدست بندگان
حضرت شاهنشاهی بقتل رسید *⁴³

"At Delhi Hīmū fought with Tardī Beg Khān, one of the nobles of the victorious state, and overcame him. In the end he was put to death by the king."

(4) The other works which corroborate this view were composed during the reign of Jahāngīr. One of them is *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* whose author Ni'matullah held the office of historiographer at the Court of Jahāngīr. His father Khwāja Habībullah of Herat was for thirty-five years in the service of Akbar and from him he could have obtained good information regarding Akbar's reign. Ni'matullah completed his work in 1613 A.D (1021 A.H). He wrote it at the command of Nawāb Khān Jahān Lodī, a high official of Jahāngīr's government, who had served Rājā Mān Singh and prince Salīm during Akbar's reign. Ni'matullah, while dealing with the reign of Shīr Shāh, says that his sources are Nizām-ud-Dīn and Abu-l Fazl but here he does not agree with any of them. His account is as follows :

شاه قلی خان فیل را پیش انداخته بملازمت بادشاه آورد و همون
را فرود آورده بنظر اشرف گذرانید و چون همون را بحضور بردند
رمقی چنان درو مانده بود خاص بنیت غزا عرش اشیانی آن کافر را بدست
خود بشمشیر سر از تن ناپاک همون جدا ساختند و بخطاب غازی
مخاطب شدند *⁴⁴

"Shah Quli Khān led the elephant to Babur [mistake for Akbar]; and, dismounting Hemoon, presented him before the monarch.....Hemoon, when carried before Akbar, breathed his last; but the Emperor, with his own hand, severed the head

43. Haft Iqlīm, fol. 188b, A. S. B. Ms. No. 283. Also fol. 135b, Ms. No. 706. Curzon collection.

44. *Makhzan-i-Afghānī*, fol. 110b. Ms. No. 100. A. S. B. ; fol. 122b. Ms. No. 102. A. S. B.

of that infidel from the body, and assumed from that moment, the title of Akbar Padishah Ghazi.”**

(5) The next work—Ma'dan-i-Akhbār-i-Ahmadī—was composed independently of the the Mughal court. It was completed about the year 1614 A.D. (1023 A.H.) by Ahmad bin Bahbal. As it is cited as an authority in the Makhjan-i-Afghānī, which was composed in 1613 A.D. (1021 A.H.), it seems to have been written a few years earlier. Its version is as follows :

و در زمانی که هر یکی از بهادران بدولت حضور رسیده کامیاب
میگشتند شاه قلی خان محرم هیمو را بسته بدرگاه آورد هر چند از او
سخن پرسیدند جواب نگفت..... و به نیت غزای و ثواب جهاد بدست
مبارک خود شمشیر برو انداختند بعد از آن بذواب خان خانان و شیخ
گدائی فرمودند که شما یان فیض بذواب غزای برسید ایشان نیز یکن یکن
شمشیر برو زدند و عالم را از لوث هستی او پاک ساختند و سر او را بکابل
فرستادند و تنه را بدار الملک دهلی برده بردار عبرت کردند عالم از شور
و شغب آرامیده * 45

“When everyone of the heroes was approaching the royal presence and obtaining what he desired, Shāh Qulī Khān Mahram brought in Hīmū, bound, to the royal camp. He did not speak even after repeated questioning [by the king]..... By way of religious warfare and for the reward of a war upon infidels the king himself struck him with sword and then asked Nawāb Khān Khānān and Shaikh Gadā'ī also to gain the reward of religious warfare. They too one by one fleshed their sword on Hīmū and cleansed the world from the impurity of his existence. His head was sent to Kābul and his body was carried to the capital city of Delhi where it was gibbeted by way of warning.”

45. Dorn—History of the Afghans—Vol. II., p. 176. The line that follows in Dorn, ‘The dead body he ordered to be cast on a dunghill’, does not occur in any of the two Mss, at the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, I have consulted.

46. Ma'dan-i-Akhbār-i-Ahmadī, fol. 155b. Ms. No. 121. India office.

The Ma'dan-i-Akhhārī Ahmadi essentially agrees with 'Arif in saying that Akbar struck Hīmū with his sword and he was helped by Bairām Khān in this action. It agrees with Bāyazīd in ascribing the spirit of bigotry in Akbar. In Bāyazīd we find Akbar tempting Hīmū to accept Islam and in Ma'dan-i-Akhhār we find him asking Bairām and Shaikh Gadā'ī to earn the merit or reward of slaying an infidel. The Ma'dan-i-Akhhār corroborates the evidence of Badāunī as regards the part taken by Shaikh Gadā'ī. I have not found any other work corroborating the statement of Bāyazīd that Akbar induced Hīmū to embrace Islam and that of Ahmad that Akbar himself asked Bairām Khān to slay Hīmū to earn the merit of a war upon infidels. The Ma'dan-i-Akhhār offers an independent version of the event and the fact that the authors of both Makhzan-i-Afghānī and Tārīkh-i-Salātīn-i-Afāghana mention it as one of their authorities, shows that it was considered a valuable work. There must have been good reason why the author of Makhzan-i-Afghānī accepted its version while rejecting that of Nizām-ud-Dīn and Abu-l Fazl both of whom he cites among his authorities.

(6) & (7) Two other works also corroborate the fourth version—those two which were quoted by Mr. Vincent Smith and on the strength of which he rejected the 'current story.' They are the Tārīkh-i-Salātīn-i-Afāghana of Ahmad Yādgār and Van den Broeck's Fragmentum in de Laet. It has been already pointed out [in the beginning of this paper] that they were not at all contemporary authorities and they are not at all sufficient to overthrow the statement of Badāunī. But they are of some importance as supplying corroborative evidence.

In Ahmad Yādgār we find the account as follows :

الغرض چون شاه قلی بیگ.....واقعه آگاهی یافت بدان پیل در
 رسید همچنان آن پیل را بحضور بیرام خان آورد بیرام خان سجدهات شکر
 بجا آورده همون را از پیل فرود آورده دست او بسته بحضور پادشاه
 جوان بخت فرزند طالع آورد و عرض نمود که چون فتم اول است

پادشاه بدست مبارک خود شمشیر بدان کافر اندازد تا بدست مبارک
شمشیر بر آن اداخته سر از تن ناپاک او جدا ساختند *⁴⁷

"When Shāh Qulī Beg was told of what had occurred, he came up to the elephant, and brought it into the presence of Bairām Khān. Bairām Khān, after prostrating himself, and returning thanks, caused Hīmūn to descend from the elephant ; after which he bound his hands, and took him before the young and fortunate Prince, and said, 'As this is our first success, let Your Highness's own august hand smite this infidel with the sword.' The Prince, accordingly struck him, and divided his head from his unclean body."⁴⁸

Pieter van den Broecke gives the following account :

"Hemou was wounded in the eye by an arrow during the fighting, and was forced to fly, but was captured and brought back by Couli-Gan [Kuli Khan Mahram]. He was brought before Achabar, who had hastened up on hearing of the rout of the Pathans ; at the request of Coulinghan he cut off the head of the prisoner with his scimitar, and ordered it to be fixed on the gate of Delly, a crime unworthy of a prince."⁴⁹

It may be interesting here to note that although the later writers down to the times of Khāfi Khān accepted the official or Abu-l Fazl's version, we find one among them giving a different account. He is Rāi Brindāban, the author of *Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh-i-Hind*, composed in 1694-95 A. D. (1106 A. H.). He says,

اورا شاه قلی خان نوکر بیرام خان بر آن فیلی که سوار بود زخمی
گرفته کنار جنگ گاه شده بخدمت آن حضرت رسانیده بروایتی آن حضرت
بقصد غزا و بقولی بیرام خان به نیزه چکر دوز (کار او) ساختند *⁵⁰

47. *Tārīkh-i-Salātīn-i-Afāghana*, fol. 115b-116a, A. S. B. Ms. No. 114 ; fol. 197b, Būhār Ms. No. 62.

48. Elliot and Dowson—*History of India as told by its own historians*—Vol. v. p. 65-66.

49. Hoyland and Banerjee—*De Laet's 'Description of India and Fragment of Indian history,'* p. 141-142.

50. *Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh*. A. S. B. Ms. No. 161, fol. 88b.

"Shāh Qulī Khān captured Hīmū lying wounded on the elephant on which he was mounted and brought him before the king. According to one version the king by way of religious warfare, while according to the other, Bairām Khān killed him with his sharp spear."

A later work—*Mirāt-i-āftāb-numā*, which was written between 1801 and 1803 A.D., accepts the version of 'Ārif Qandahārī. It was composed by the prime minister of Shāh 'Ālam, 'Abd-ur-Rahmān Shāhnawāz Khān. He makes Akbar directly responsible for the death of Hīmū.

بعد از چند روز خبر رسید که هیمو بقال خود را بکرماجیت نام
نهادہ جڈون جہانپانی در سردار د و با ہفتاد ہزار سوار و توب خانہ
بسیار و یکہزار فیل جنگی در فتنہ سازیست با ستماع اینخبر عازم
استیصال او شدند در فواحی پانی پت آنرا بقتل رسانیدہ: مظفر و
منصور در دہلی داخل شد *⁵¹

"A few days after report came that Hīmū the grocer had styled himself Vikramājī and was aspiring to sovereignty and with 70,000 horsemen, huge artillery and 1,000 war elephants was causing disturbance. On hearing this news (Akbar) proceeded to extirpate him. In the environs of Panipat he put Hīmū to death and triumphantly entered Delhi."

§ 11. Conclusion.

To sum up, we reject the story of Akbar's magnanimity and refusal to slay a fallen infidel and accept the version that Akbar struck Hīmū with sword without any hesitation in order to gain the title of ghāzī and the reward of jihād. First, because this version is supported by the contemporary authorities. Secondly, it is supported by others who, if not contemporary, wrote towards the

51. *Mirāt-i-āftāb-numā*, A. S. B. Ms. Curzon Collection, II. 348, fol. 301 a-b.

end of Akbar's and the early part of Jahāngīr's reign. Thirdly, it is corroborated by the evidence of several historians who wrote independently of the Mughal court. Only one historian of this class supports the view of Abu-l Fazl—the author of *Tārikh-i-Dāūdī*. Fourthly, while we can suspect that Abu-l Fazl, Nizām-ud-Dīn and all their supporters excepting Badāunī and 'Abdullah (about whom we know nothing) were guilty of omission and commission in order to suppress the defects of their patron, we cannot reasonably lay any charge of falsification on the supporters of this version. It may be argued that those historians, who state that Akbar killed Hīmū in order to be ghāzī, do so in order to add glory to his name—glory as they understood it. To this argument it may be pointed out that those who wrote under the patronage of the emperor himself like 'Ārif, Bāyazīd, Muhammad Sharif and Tāhīr Muhammad, knew quite well that their patron would very much dislike to add such glory to his name for all these works were written at a time when Akbar had already shown great leaning towards the Hindus and Hinduism. And those, who wrote independently of the Mughal court like Amīn Rāzī, Ahmad bin Bahbal and others, had no good reason to make false statement in order to add glory to the name of one with whom they had no connection. We do not find in their writings any evidence of hostility against Akbar; so the argument that they wanted to vilify the emperor cannot be maintained.

As regards such minor details—whether Bairām Khān begged Akbar to slay Hīmū with his own hand in order to obtain the title of ghāzī, or whether Akbar induced Hīmū to embrace Islam, as Bāyazīd says, or whether Akbar on his own initiative struck Hīmū and asked Bairām and others to participate in the jihād, as Ahmad bin Bahbal states, we cannot come to a sure conclusion. It was quite natural on the part of Bairām Khān to request the prince to obtain the title of ghāzī by fleshing his sword on the infidel captive; but this fact is mentioned neither by the two contemporary authorities nor by the authors of *Majāmi'-ul-Akhhbār*, *Haft Iqlīm*, *Ma'dan-i-Akhhbār* and *Makhzan-i-Afghānī*. As regards Bairām's part in the action we are a bit more certain; it is mentioned by the majority of the historians as well as by one of the contemporary authorities—'Ārif Qandahārī. So we may accept that Bairām Khān helped the king in the execution of Hīmū.

In conclusion we may record the 'Hīmū incident' as follows : Shāh Qulī Khān Mahram brought the wounded Hīmū before the king. Akbar struck him with sword in order to gain the reward of jihād and the title of ghāzī. Bairām Khān followed him and fleshed his sword on the captive. From this we may safely conclude that Akbar was born an orthodox Mussalman, sharing the bigotry of his contemporaries and that his kind disposition and broad humanity were the development of his maturer years.

The 'Hīmū incident' illustrates the way in which history is falsified when it becomes the hand-maid of despotism. The story of Akbar's magnanimity was probably invented or at least made current by the emperor himself who in his later life could not justify his action—the *Tārīkh-i-Alfi* is the first work to mention it. It was naturally accepted and exaggerated by Abu-l Fazl who regarded that a jihād would result in 'fancied merit' and had no real efficacy and who was ever anxious to hide the defects of his patron. Nizām-ud-Dīn seems to have avoided the matter and is guilty of omission rather than of commission. The wonder is how Badāūnī accepted the story.⁵² The story originated and gained ground because it suited the truly great character of Akbar as it developed in his mature years. The halo that gathered round the personality of the emperor and which distance of years only enhanced helped the development of the story and contributed to its popularity. Later historians of the 17th and 18th centuries excepting Rāi Brindāban and 'Abd-ur-Rahmān, all accepted it without any hesitation or least doubt. The acceptance of the story by modern scholars beginning from Dow is partly accounted for by this fact as well as their failure to consult all the authorities for the incident. To Mr. Vincent Smith belongs the credit of first rejecting the current story. But his conclusion has been accepted or rejected, for reasons already stated, according to the likings and dislikings of authors who have written general

52. One thing we should not fail to notice : behind the bitter sectarian prejudices and forcible censures of Akbar's religious policy that fill his pages, there is the courtier, greedy to seek royal favour and not without veneration for the royal person. Badāūnī is hostile to Akbar only where he deviated from orthodox Islam. Scholars have placed too much confidence in his veracity.

histories since the publication of his article and his monograph on Akbar. The present investigation, based on an exhaustive study of all available materials, discredits the current story of Akbar's magnanimity and hardly, I believe, leaves any room for any difference of opinion.⁵³



53. In publishing this paper I should express my indebtedness to my Professor Dr. R. C. Majumdār, M. A., Ph. D. who has kindly procured for me some Mss. on loan from the India Office Library, London, and permission to use the Imperial and Būhār Libraries as well as the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and has kindly revised the Paper ; to Sir J. N. Sarkār, Kt. C. I. E. for the generous loan of his Ms ; to Dr. W. H. A. Shādāni, M. A., Ph. D., for his kindness in helping me in understanding and translating difficult Persian words and phrases and to Shams-ul-'ulamā' M. Hidāyet Husain, Ph. D., Khān Bahādur for kindly offering me facilities at the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. I must also acknowledge my debt to Dr. L. D. Barnett, D. Litt., Keeper of the Department of Oriental Printed Books & Mss., British Museum ; to the Librarian, India Office Library ; and to Mr. A. J. Arberry, Assistant Keeper of Oriental Books and Mss. India Office Library for their kindness in helping me in various ways in connection with manuscripts in the British Museum and India Office Library, London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

[PRINTED WORKS]

1. Akbar Nāma by Abu-l Fazl. A. S. B. Text. Also Lucknow Text.
2. Ma'aṣir-i-Raḥīmī by 'Abd-ul Bāqī Nahāvandī. A. S. B. Text.
3. Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb by Khāfī Khān. A. S. B. Text.
4. Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh by 'Abd-ul-Qādir Badāūnī. A. S. B. Text.
5. Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī by Niẓām-ud-Dīn Aḥmad. A. S. B. Text. Also Lucknow Text.
6. Tārīkh-i-Firishṭa by Muḥammad Qāsim Hindū Shāh, better known as Firishṭa. Lucknow Text.
7. Tūzūk-i-Jahāngīrī. Lucknow Text. Newal Kishore.

[MANUSCRIPTS]

1. Aḥsan-ut-Tawārīkh by Ḥasan bin Muḥammad-ul-Khākī-ush-Shirāzī. British Museum. Or. 1649.
2. Bodleian Ms. No. 101. An anonymous work composed probably during Jahāngīr's reign.
3. Haft Iqlīm by Amīn Aḥmad Rāzī. A. S. B.
4. Iqbāl Nāma by Mu'tamad Khān. Vol. II. Būhār Library.
5. Khulāṣat-ut-Tawārīkh by Sujān Rāi Bhandārī. A. S. B.
6. Lubb-ut-Tawārīkh-i-Hind by Rāi Brindāban. A. S. B.
7. Ma'dan-i-Akhbār-i-Aḥmadī. by Aḥmad bin Bahbal, India Office.
8. Majāmī'-ul-Akhbār by Muḥammad Sharīf-ul-Ḥusainī known as Waqū'ī, India Office.
9. Mirāt-ul-'Ālam by Muḥammad Bakhtāwar Khān. Būhār Library.
10. Mirāt-i-āftāb-numā by 'Abd-ur-Raḥmān Shāhnawāz Khān, A. S. B. Ms. Curzon collection.
11. Mukhtaṣar by Bāyazīd Biyāt. India Office.
12. Rauzat-ut-Tāhīrīn by Tāhir Muḥammad Ḥasan 'Imād-ud-Dīn, British Museum. Also Būhār Library.

13. Tārīkh-i-Alfi by Ja'far Beg Āṣaf Khān. 4th Vol. India Office. Also British Museum.

14. Tārīkh-i-Akbarī by 'Ārif Qandahārī. Sir J. N. Sarkār's Ms.

15. Tārīkh-i-Ḥaqqī by 'Abd-ul Ḥaḡ. Bodleian Library ; Also British Museum.

16. Tārīkh-i-Khān Jahānī Makhzan-i-Afghānī by Khawāja Ni'matullah. A. S. B.

17. Tārīkh-i-Salāṭīn-i-Afāghana by Aḡmad Yādgār, A. S. B. Ms. Also Būhār Library Ms.

18. Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī by 'Abdullah. British Museum.

19. Tawārīkh-i-Akbar Nāma by Shaiikh Ilāhdād Faizī Sirhindī. British Museum. Also India Office.

20. Tazkirat-us-Salāṭīn-i-Chaghṭa by Muḡammad Hādī. A. S. B. Ms.

21. Wāqī'āt-i-Muṣhtāqī by Shaiikh Rizqullah. British Museum.

22. Zubdat-ut-Tawārīkh by Nūr-ul-Ḥaḡ. India Office.

English Translations of the following works have also been used :

Printed works—1, 4 and 7.

Manuscripts—16 and 17 (extracts only).

[EUROPEAN SOURCE]

1. De Laet's 'Description of India and Fragment of Indian History.' Translated by J. S. Hoyland and annotated by S. N. Banerjee.

AN OLD-JAVANESE INSCRIPTION OF THE SAKA YEAR 841.

HIMANSU BHUSAN SARKAR M.A.

(Research scholar, Dacca University).

This inscription belongs to the reign of king Tulodang and has been incised on a set of three copper-plates. It is a matter of great regret that the exact find-spot of this record is not known. Dr. Krom¹ remarks, however, that there are some place-names in the inscription which we find earlier in central and then also in Eastern Java and that among the people mentioned we come across a religious functionary (*marhyang*) of Diëng and an inmate of the cloister of Siddhakārya belonging to Diëng. The reference to Diëng is not however of great importance, unless other place-names of this inscription are found in the Diëng-region. For, in the inscription of Kěmbang Arum², whose find-spot is exactly known, the sixth *rāma māgaman* is "the maker of the stone for the free-hold, (named) *Si Śrū*, father of Bukang, hailing from *Ḍihyang*" (pl. II, 13). He thus came to Kěmbang Arum in Jogjakarta from a far-off place. The reputation of Diëng in spiritual matters was such that it was found necessary on many festive occasions to invite people (mainly religious) from that region. For finding out the *locale* of the inscription, it is necessary therefore to make a detailed examination of the geographical names of this inscription and search them in other records of Java. This has led me to the following results. It has been found, for example, that the names of Layang, Lintakan, Wru, Kasugihan, Turumangamwil, Miramirah, Pikatan, Datar, Wungkuḍu, Sangan, Manggulungi, Mataram, Kabanyāgān, Wuga, Kahuripan, Talaga, Gilikan, Pakalangkyangan and Watuwatu are also found in other inscriptions of Java. Whenever the

1. *Geschiedenis*², p. 194.

2. *OV*, 1925, Bijl. B.

find-spot of these records is known, they refer in most cases to the region of Kědu and in several cases, where the exact find-spot is not known, they have been obtained from Jogjakarta. Thus, *OJO* XXII, ll. 14-15 (823 Śāka, Kědu), *KO* XIV, pl. B. 1 (803 Śāka, Kědu), *KO* XV, pl. B. 9 (804 Śāka, Kědu) have all mentioned the place of Kasugihan.¹ Similarly, in *OJO* II, V°. 3 (731 Śāka, Diēng) a place is found under Pikatan, while *OJO* VI, l. 5 (775 Śāka)² presents a *raka* of Pikatan. A *raka* of Pikatan is also mentioned in *OJO* VIII (786 Śāka), obtained from Kědu. The name reminds us, above all, of the *raka* of Pikatan who has been mentioned in the dynastic list of Matarām-kings, found in the well-known inscription from Kědu.³ A *pamagat* Pikatan is also found in the inscription of Kěmbang Arum, pl. III a 13, found in Jogjakarta. In the map the place Pikatan has been shown to the North-east of Sumbing. The name of the place Kabanyāgān which occurs in the record under review is also noticed in *OJO* VI described above. Similarly in the inscription of Kuburan Caṇḍi, r°. 5 (753 Śāka, Kědu)⁴, we find the name of *Pamgět* Wuga. This Wuga appears to be a place about Prāmbānān.⁵ It is perhaps more interesting to note that the place Pakalangkyangan is under Pagar wēsi both in the record under review as also in the inscription of Kěmbang Arum⁶. Similarly, the place called Wungkuḍu

1. A place of this name also occurs in *OJO* CIII, b. As several place-names of this inscription are found in the records from Kědu, there is a great possibility that *OJO* CIII refers to that region or its neighbourhood. Mr. Holle remarked in *VBG* XXXIX B p. 2 that this inscription has palaeographical affinity with *KO* XVII, which, as Cohen Stuart has observed (*KO*, p. XII), has the same script as *KO*. I. A place of this name has also been mentioned in the copper-plate of Solo, published in *OV*, 1922, Bijil. L (see r°. 2) with corrections of Goris in *Ibid.*, 1928, pp. 65-66. Its find-spot has not been described.

2. In *TBG*, 47, p. 455, it has been described that the inscription was obtained from Kědu.

3. *TBG*, 67, pp. 172-215, particularly pp. 194-95, 210,

4. *Ibid.*, 70, pp. 157-170.

5. *OV*, 1928, pp. 65-66.

6. It should be remembered that though Kěmbang Arum has been included in the residency of Jogjakarta, it is very near the border-lands of Kědu.

is under Kilipan¹ both in this record as also in the inscription of Kēmbang Arum (Pl. II, 3). Moreover, in the copper-plate of 828 (?) Śāka (*OV*, 1917), obtained from the neighbourhood of Barabudur in Kēdu, we find the village of Srganan. Several inscriptions, whose find-spots are more or less unknown, mention the names of Layang², Lintakan³, Turumangamwil⁴, Miramiraḥ⁵,

1. The name has evidently been misread by Cohen Stuart while editing *KO* I. Kilipan is also known from other sources. Cf. The Amsterdam inscription of Balitung, (Inscr. I, V° 15) published by Dr. Van Naerssen in *Mededeeling no. XXXVI, afd. volk. no. 7, of the Royal Colonial Institute of Amsterdam*.

2. Cf. *OJO*, XXXVI, V°. 12. According to the conjecture of Rouffaer in *Notulen*, 1909, p. LXXVIII, it was obtained from Taji near Prāmbānān. A place called Layang is also found in *KO* IX, 1 b 4 (808 Śāka). *KO* XVII of the time of Dakṣa mentions this place several times (II, 16, 18, 23, 27). As has been mentioned before this record has palaeographical similarity with the record under notice.

3. Cf. *OJO*, CIII a. It belonged to the collection of Dieduksman at Jogja.

4. In the copper-plate of 800 Śāka (Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya*, p. 75), we find Taru° which is obviously Turu° of our record. In the copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (*OV*, 1928, pp. 66-67), in A. 11, this place has been mentioned. Its find-spot is not, however, known. In *OJO* XXXIII, II, 3-4 (848 (?) Śāka), there is the mutilated name of a village, read as Tu()mangambil. The letters left out are probably *ru* and hence we find Turu°. It has been described that the inscription is from Jēdung. Dr. Stutterheim has shown however in *TBG*, 67, p. 174 that the self-same record could also be engraved on bronze or copper-plates and even on paper (*lontar*). Can *OJO* XXXIII be one of such records, originally belonging to Central Java? Because, besides Turumangambil, the name of Miramiraḥ of this inscription is also found in Central Java. The copper-plate of 800 Śāka described by Poerbatjaraka in his *Agastya* is dated only 48 years prior to *OJO* XXXIII and handles over institutions of Central Java. So *OJO* XXXIII may also refer to Central Java.

5. As observed in the preceding note, Miramiraḥ is mentioned in *OJO* XXXIII. In the important inscription of Kēdu published by Dr. Stutterheim we also find the name of this place (*TBG*, 67, p. 207). A place of this name has also been mentioned in a copper-plate of the Museum at Solo, V°. 4 (*OV*, 1922, Bijil. L). Its find-spot has not been described. But on reference to the geographical places of this record, it is possible to prove that the inscription is connected with Central Java.

Datar¹, Mataram², Manggulungi³, Kahuripan⁴, Talaga⁵, Gilikan⁶, Watuwatu⁷ and Wru.⁸ There are reasons to believe that these inscriptions, at least some of them, mentioning these place-names, originally belonged to central Java. To take one instance: the names of Lintakan, Gilikan, Turumangamwil and Kasugihan of our record occur in *OJO CIII a*. Similarity of one or two names may be quite accidental, but when series of indetical geographical names are found in two records, the coincidence cannot be due to mere accident. When we consider with these facts the palaeographical affinity of such records, the question is more or less decided.⁹ But

1. A *patih* datar has been mentioned in *OJO CIV a*. This inscription was obtained from the Regent of Banjarnegara, res. Banjumas. As the find-spot is not known, the reference is practically valueless. A search of the geographical names of this inscription in other records of Java may however indicate its origin. Meanwhile, it may be remarked that the reference to the *guru hyang* of Kelasa in Pl. 1b serves to show that it is possibly connected with the Diëng region or Central Java.

2. This name has been mentioned in the copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (*OV*, 1928, pp. 66-67), pl. A. 11. Along with Turumangamwil several names of this inscription are found in records from Central Java.

3. Mulak is under Manggulungi in the copper-plate described in the previous note.

4. The *desa* Kahuripan mentioned in our record and in *Jayapatra II* (*OV*, 1925, pp. 59-60) is perhaps the same as Kuripan, i. e., the plain about Baratengah (inv. no. 1034). See the remarks of Dr. Goris on this name in his edition of the inscription of Kuburan Cañdi in *TBG*, 70, pp. 157-170.

5. It has been described as a place in *KO X*, 1 a 5 (802 Śaka). The find-spot of this record is not known but from several place-names it appears to refer to the heart of Middle-Java.

6. This place is mentioned in *OJO CII a* 5, 12 and *OJO CIII a*. Both these records belonged to the collection of Dieduksman at Jogja. In the copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (*OV*, 1928, pp. 66-67), the place has been mentioned again.

7. In another copper-plate of the Museum at Solo (*OV*, 1922, Bijl. L) r°. 3 a place of this name has been mentioned.

8. A place has been described under Wru in the copper-plate of Solo mentioned in note 6 above.

9. Judging from this point of view, *KO XVII*, copper-plates of Solo (*OV*, 1922, Bijl. L; *OV*, 1928, pp. 66-67) should provisionally be regarded to belong to Central Java, perhaps the region of Kedu.

to return to our point. We have probably succeeded in showing above that most of the geographical names of our inscription, so far as they can be identified, occur in the border-districts of Southern Kědu and Northern Jogjakarta. We may therefore provisionally conclude that the inscription originally belonged to this region. It may also be noted in this connexion that the officers or class of people called *rāma māgaman*, *rāma marata*, *tunggu durung*, *rakryān mawannua*, etc., do not appear in inscriptions from the eleventh century A. D. onwards and that they do not usually appear in records of Eastern Java. As some of these persons are noticed in our inscription, they may offer some indication regarding its source, which, as we have seen from other evidence, is probably the border-region between Kědu and Jogjakarta.

The record was in the possession of the *pangeran ngabehi* of Jogjakarta who presented¹ it to the Batavian Society in 1865/66. It is a very lengthy inscription and measures 56×25 c. m. approximately. It is engraved on one side alone of each of the three plates which appear to be made up of copper-alloy. The true import of this record was not realised for a long time owing to the doubtful arrangement of letters by Cohen Stuart in a particularly important line, but the ingenuity of Dr. Poerbatjaraka² has cleared the mystery and we now know that king Tulodang of Central Java, whose known dates range between 919-921 A. D., created free-holds at Kasugihan and other places for *caru*-offering to his father cremated at Turumangambil. Like the inscription of Kěmbang Arum, the record under review presents an imposing array of officers³ and other persons who received gifts of various kinds. Most of the names and titles of this record are purely Indonesian and very few are Sanskritic names. Even in the case of the latter it is difficult to say if we are to regard them as Indians or Hinduised Javans. These difficulties must always occur in our study of Old-Javanese records. Similar is the case with

1. *Notuten* IV, p. 140 ; *KO*, p. V.

2. *Agastya*, p. 77.

3. An alphabetical list of these officers has been given in the Appendix.

names of persons, titles and places, which are only worse confounded in Java and can be distinguished, if at all, after great difficulty. Such as has happened in many inscriptions, titles of persons and place-names are identical in many cases.

Though the inscription does not throw ample light on the administration of villages, we can still glean some data for historical purposes. Many village-officers are mentioned in the inscription, but we are quite in the dark regarding the function of the majority of them. The village-people are divided into various classes. Reference may be made to the terms like *anak banua*, *tuha banua*, etc., which frequently occur in the record under review. The headman of the village had certain amount of control over property. This becomes evident when we consider that the king marked out forests at Lintakan and Tunah (pl. 1, 2) without reference to anybody, but in founding free-holds on the *sawah*-fields at Kasugihan, he had to purchase the lands by money (pl. 1, ll. 11, 13, 16). The record also gives us a glimpse of the festivities of Central Java towards the beginning of the tenth century A.D. On the occasion of founding free-holds, there was a general feast in which men and women, old and young,—all participated.¹ Eating, drinking and dancing have been mentioned in this connexion. They also painted themselves and made toilette with flowers. Dancing was indeed very much liked throughout Java, for this has not only been referred to here, but also in a large number of inscriptions, and sometimes princesses have been described as “*nrĕtta racanādi gūṇa kośali*.”² The wines called *tuak* and *ciñca* were drunk on these festive occasions and there was the music of *gamĕlan*, *tuwung*, *rĕgang*, *gaṇḍi*, and *rāwanahasta*. The classification of iron-implements in connexion with *saji*-offerings clearly indicates an advanced

1. Regarding the allocation of seats of these people, see the elaborate description in the inscription of Kĕmbang Arum in *OV*, 1925, Bijl. B, pl. III a, 13-14 and the remarks of Dr. Bosch in *Ibid.*, p. 47f. A somewhat original arrangements of seats is described in an inscription of the time of Balitung, published by Dr. Van Naerssen in the *Mededeeling, op. cit.*, inscr. II, r°. 13f.

2. Inscription of Trawulan, pl. 1, r° 6 in *OV*, 1918, Bijl. K; also cf. *OJO*, LXXXIV, r°, 6-7.

stage in craftsmanship. About trade, internal or external, we have no direct reference, but mention is made of several types of coins. Various kinds of clothes have been mentioned and of them, great importance attaches to the *pilih magëng*-cloth, *kalyāga*-cloth, *ambay-ambay*-cloth and *sulasih*-cloth. In contemporary inscriptions we find reference to another pattern of very valuable cloth, viz., *gañjar pātra sisi*¹, but it has not been mentioned in our inscription. It, however, refers to under-cloth for women. That the position of women was not low appears from the fact that the wives of officers received gifts along with their husbands.

Various religious functionaries have also been mentioned, such as, *marhyang*, *wahuta hyang kudur*, etc. In pl. I,₁, we find reference to a cloister at Siddhakārya and this name seems to smack of Tāntric influence. Among the temples, those at Dīhyang, Jamwu, Samadi and Putar have been explicitly mentioned in pl. 2,₁₄. The invocation to deities in the stereotyped imprecatory formulae in the concluding portion of this record is highly interesting and is of 'special value on account of the explanation offered for smashing eggs and cutting the neck of hens. The same explanation has been given in some other records.

I re-edit this inscription which was first transcribed by Cohen Stuart from his facsimile in *Kawi Oorkonden*, No. I, adding an English translation.

TEXT

1, 1. swasti śakawarṣatita 841 śrāvaṇa-māsa tithi dwādaśi śukla-pakṣa², mawulu, umanis, somawāra, mūla nakṣatra, nenṛti dewatā

1. cf. inscription of *Këmbang Arum*, op. cit., pl. 1 : 9 ; the inscription of Këdu published by Stutterheim in *TBG*, 67, p. 206. In *OJO* XXII, 1. 8 we find a kind of cloth called *kagañja haji pātra sisi*.

2. FS. has *kṣang. [FS.=facsimile].

2. waidhrti yoga, nairiti-deśa, irikā diwasa śrī ma | hārāja rakai layang dyah tloḍong śrī sajjana-sanmatanuraga¹ tanggadewa² sumusuk. ikana alas. i lintakan. watak. malintaki, muang alas. i tunaḥ (ku° ?) watak. sinapan (pi° ?). muang

3. hanata sūkan. | i wru watak. magañjar. i marhyang, parṇnahanya umuayana ikanang sima, hanata sawah i kasugihan. tampaḥ 1 wetan nikanang lmaḥ i tunaḥ muang i lintakan, yata winli.

4. mahārāja irikanang rāma i kasugihan. | pirak³ kā 1 dhā 13 mā 6 yata matēhēr. milu sinima paknānya (?) carua i caitya ni yayah⁴ śrī mahārāja i turamangambil, ikeng lmaḥ.

5. sinusuk lmaḥ kidul ni turus ike, kmitan i mamrāti tilimpi | k ike, kunang matangyan-nilu⁵ taṇḍa rakryān kabeh kinannān pasak pasak mua(ng) parujar nira, yathānyan pari-pūrṇa kasusukan ikanang sima mapagēha tkā i (ng ?) dlāha ning dlāha

6. yata matangyan mangke uninikeng | prasaṣṭi inangsēan taṇḍa rakryān kabaih pagē-pagēh sa-byawastha ning manusuk sīma, hino rikang kāla pu ketudhara maṇimantaprabhā prabhu śakti triwikrama, wḍihan pilih magēng yu 1 mas su 1 mā 4 rakai halu.

7. | pu siṇḍok, rakai sirikan pu hawang, rakai wka pu kirāṇa inangsēan wḍihan katyāga yu 1 mas mā 1, ing sowang sowang, mamrāti pu ḍapit, tilimpik pu paṇḍamunn, inangsēan¹ wḍihan.

8. āmbay-ambay yu 1 | mas mā 4 ing sowang, sowang, samgat momahumah pikatan pu kambaladhara, inangsēan wḍihan sulasih yu 1 mas mā 8 tiruan (°nu° ?) pu cakra inasēan wḍihan ambay

9. ambay yu 1 mas mā 5 halaran pu wihikan pala | rhyang pu balandung, dalinan pu parbwata, manghūri pu teja, pangkur pu jayanta, tawān pu sena, tirip pu hariwangsa, wadihati pu nanggala, makudur pu dhanuka, kapua inangsēan wḍihan ambay

1. C. Stuart put two doubtful queries here, viz., °Santatanu° and °tānu°, though he accepted the reading of *sannatanuraga*. For the reading of Dr. Brandes, See *OJO.*, p. 266.

2. Read tu°.

3. FS. has wi°.

4. This statement is according to the emendation of Dr. Poerbatjaraka in *Agastya*, p. 77.

5. For the reading of Brandes, see *op. cit.* C. Stuart puts the query (°n milu ?).

10. ambay yu 1 mas mā 4 ing so | wang sowang, sang (si ?) sinapan (pi° ?) maka wanua ikanang ri tunah sang panggunaan (°ru° ?), inangsēan wḍihan ambay-ambay yu 1 mas mā 8 manglintaki pu sawitra, inangsēan ken wlah 1 mas mā 8 tuhān i wadihati,

11. 2 miramirah pu sudanta anak ba | nua i miramirah, mangrangkapi sang lbur poh pu' wikasita anak banua i ḍatar watak ḍatar, tuhān i makudur 2 lingo sang manghandul anak banua i kinaling kabinihajyan, mangrangkapi sang manglage anak banua

12. i pulung wata | k makudur wahuta hyang kudur lumaku manusuk, i wadihati sang² wada, anak banua i sumbhāgi watak panghrēmban (?) i makudur sang² mangantus anak banua i jurungan watak pagar wsi winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas

13. mā | 4 ing sowang sowang, parujar i hino kaṇḍamui sang kasura (?), anak banua i wungkuḍu watak kilisan³, parujar i halu wisāga sawidyānidhi⁴, anak banua i hilyan watak.

14. padlagan, anurat i hino ing pangujaran wu | ngkal warapi sang śuddha anak banua ing kabikuan ing kamyang ing jantur parujar i (ng ?) sirikan hujung galuh sang tatwa, anak banua i srāngan watak srāngan, parujar i wka wiridih sang kirtadhara.

15. anak wanua i huntu watēk pu (hu ?) | taddhaṇu, parujar i tiruan (°nu° ?) sumuḍan sang prājña anak wanua ing kabikuan ing siddhakāryya mangasē i ḍihyang, pradeśa ni wungaṇḍaṇu paru

16. jar i halaran sang adigama anak banua i jahayan watē | k halu parujar i palar hyang sang mañca anak banua i sumuḍa watak-ēḍḅengan (°ētē° ?) parujar⁵ i dalīnan sang trisaraṇa anak banua i muntang watak upit parujar i pangkur didēlan (dēdē° ?)

17. sang aplik anak i rakadut watak rannyā (?), parujar i habāngan (?) aluk sang nirmmala anak banua i manggulungi watak manggulungi parujar i tirip sang ṣṭanggīl (?) anak banua

2, 1. i | mataram i kamaṇikan watak kabulunan parujar i mamrati turuhan hawang ananta anak banua i kabanyāgān ing galuh

1. FS. has *su*.

2. FS. has *si*.

3. Or : Kilipan.

4. FS. has °*dyānigi*.

5. FS. has °*jarā*.

2. parujar i tilimpik wkawka si pawana anak banua i | wuga watak pëar winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas mā 1 ing sowang sowang anurat i mamrati kṛp sang ludra anak banua i mandahi watak mandahi anurat i tilimpik patilaman sang ladwāngga (khaṭwā°?)

3. | anak banua i kahuripan watak pagar wsi winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas mā 1 ing sowang sowang wahuta i mamrati prih si godhā anak banua i talaga watak mamrati wahuta i tilim.

4. pik jukuter | si dewa anak banua i wërëhnya watak tilimpik winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas mā 2 ing sowang sowang pihujung i pangkur si manda anak banua i lua watak lua pihu.

5. jung i tawān lua sukun anak banua i lua | watak tañjung, pihujung i tirip panawungan anak banua i panawungan watak tirip winehan wḍihan rangga hle mas mā 1 i sowang sowang, wahuta kahulunan dumling turuy si bikṛma anak banua i skar

6. amway pu | npunan i tangar patih gilikan si muṇḍi rama ni wagad patih tigang sugih si cakër ramani ratha patih panggil si balikuh winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas mā 1 ing sowang sowang.

7. anakbinya kapua winehan ken | wlah 1 ing sowang sowang parujar ning patih gilikan sawahu¹ rama-ni dungis², parujarni tigang sugih (gu°?) si knoh ramani wanayī parujar ning patih panggil is wërë (?) ramani taśah (?) winehan wḍihan rangga hle 1 mas³ ku 2 ing sowang sowang rāma māg

8. man (?) ing | kaśugihan kalang si walawo (?) ramani rawi tuha wanua si jalung (?) ramaniṅ gunu (°ru?), gusti 6 (?) padma ramani wrël si ranggël ramani bukat syanggirā ramani lalati si rëši ramani pahing si jambhala ramani gayuk winkas si kpu

9. ramani gyak winehan wḍi | han rangga yu 1 mas mā 1 i sowang sowang anakbinya kapua winehan ken wlah 1 ing sowang sowang wariga si paraši ramani wugël parujar 2 si bamaṇa ramani nek si bkyah ramani pacang (?) winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1

1. FS. has °gahu.

2. FS. has °bis.

3. FS. has map.

10. mas ku 6 ing | sowang sowang anakbinya kapua winehan ken wlah 1 ing sowang sowang rama maratā si tanggul ramani dulang si narā ramani gawul winehan mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang

11. kalang i lintakan si kuñjar ramani subhi gusti 6 si ka | yuara rama ni kpu si wgil ramani warangan si dewa si bayatu rama ni cabur (°ngur ?) tuha banua si mahi ramani baśri winkas si guwinda ramani jo winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas mā 1 ing

12. sowang sowang anakbinya kapua | winehan ken wlah 1 ing sowang sowang parujar 2 si śanti ramani mangiring si lakṣaṇa ramani kamwing (ta° ?) winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang anakbinya kapua winehan ken wlah 1 ing

13. sowang sowang wariga si samwi¹ | ramani ti winehan wḍihan rangga hle 1 mas ku 2 muwah wariga ramani ksil huler si jawa ramani bari tuha wirēh (wē° ?) 6 (?) si gomanta ramani pahēhan si wahu rama ni waluh si janggi rēgik rama ni buddhi

14. marhyang i ḍihyang sang bilu | t rama ni wajang marhyang ing jamwu si candra rama ni waḍi marhyang i samaḍi punta unes (?) marhyang ing putar (°kar ?) si wawuat rama ni mañcing tañjēning (°jö° ?) kalang si tguh ramani ṇḍikan ranē apanti si pu

15. lakas rama ni baddha (bandha ?) rāma matuha si ma | hi rama ni limwang rāma maratā sang kalyāna rama ni tapa kapua winehan mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang kalang i tunah si mwohok rama ni krānta gusti 3 si añjing rama ni ndurukan si lēga rama ni nandaka

16. | si pañjol rama ni baśu tuha banua si sarwwa rama ni prahana winkas si gujil rama ni yowana winehan wḍihan rangga² yu 1 mas mā 1 ing sowang sowang anakbinya kapua winehan ken

17. wlah 1 ing sowang sowang parujar | 2 si tarah (?) rama n mḍang rama ni ayi winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang anakbinya kapua winehan ken wlah 1 ing sowang sowang wariga si buru rama ni mundiki winehan wḍihan rangga hle 1

18. mas ku 2 pa | wah wariga si bāma ra (ma) ni uḍuh huler si mukmuk rama ni ṇḍokoh tuha wērēh 2 si mangalap si hunur rama maratā si wada kakiwangi si mbēyēng (mwē° ?) rama ni kupu wi

1. FS. has *pa°*.

2. FS. has *ranga*.

19. nehan mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang, kalang i wra si ges | rama ni bining gusti 6 si kwah rama ni kpu si wangah, si garjita, si pañjol rama ni cangkak tuha banua si lakwan rama ni kucyak winkas si palaku winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas mā 1

20. ing sowang sowang, anakwi (bi ?) | -nya kapu (a) winehan ken wlah 1 ing sowang sowang, parujar 2 si lēwē rama ni bari si lutung rama ni puṇḍuk winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang, anakbinya kapua winehan ken wlah 1

3. 1. ing so | wang sowang wariga si garu rama ni samwī winehan hle 1 mas ku 2 huler si luka rama ni ḍaha winehan mas ku 2 sāma tpi siring umilu pinaka sākṣi rikanang suśukan

2. sīma rāma i sawyan (°tya° ?) gusti si anggu rama ni gi | lēh kalang si nek rama ni dalihan parujar si luting rama ni ḍngil rāma i luītan kalang si hiri rama ni datti parujar 2 si kaṭū (?) rama ni kuśala si dagū rama ni blyah kalang i tigang sugih si sungkul

3. rama ni koḍo gusti¹ | si kuring rama ni balam parujar si kḍangan kalang i parang si btah rama ni tarima tuha banua si kanti kaki bhawita parujar si ḍatang rama ni barubuh, tuha banua i gilikan si kalamwuay parujar 2 si hṇg rama ni

4. ḍungas si knoh | rama ni wanayi kalang i kalawukan si gaṇa rama ni darā gusti si tarkha rama ni godhi parujar si glo ikanang kalang gusti tuha banua kabaih ing tpi siring winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang, ikanang pa

5. rujar ka | baih kapua winehan wḍihan rangga hle 1 mas ku 2 ing sowa (ng) sowang rāma i turumangamwil milu pinakasākṣi si waraṇa rama ni bhukti (°i ?) kalang si arta rama ni dhyāna winehan wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas ku 2 ing sowang sowang anakbinya

6. winaiha | n ken wla(h) 1 ing sowang sowang parujar si padma winehan wḍihan rangga hle 1 mas ku 2 samangkana ikanang rarai lakilaki waduan dinūman pirak anātak anakupang wi

7. nehan wsi kāyānurūpa atapukan milu rikanang suśukan | sīma si rahulu rama ni mariṣa (°ripa ?) anak banua i paglutan watak tiru ranu si marūm rama ni tarima anak wanua i kahutanan watak mataram si piñjungan¹ rama ni namwi anak banua i

1. FS. has *gusi*.

2. FS. has *pi°*.

8. mangěwěl watak anggul (?) si patanghuran anak banu | a i wěngkal watak dalinan si balilu anak banua i paniruan watak panggil hyang si bisama anak banua i pakalangkyangan watak pagar wsi si lamayung anak banua i watuwatu watak watuwatu piṇḍa

9. atapukan | prāṇa 3 hop (hopā ?) rari winehan pirak dhā 1 kinabaihanya tarimwanya winehan pirak mā 1 kinabaihanya, pininang mawuaya i marěbung muang ri wulung winehan pirak mā 8 ing sawanua sawanua, muwah sang wirěh (wě° ?) i kaśugihan

10. | milu mawuay winehan pirak mā 2 tlas sangsipta ikanang pasik pasak muang saji masamakṣa sira kabaih irikanang lmaḥ i kunah (tu° ?) wāhu sinīma umunggu i taratag mamangan manginum maparimwangi mapangalih majnu maskar krama nikanang ka

11. | ngan¹ haḍangan prāṇa 4 mamulya pirak dhā 5 mā 8 ing sawiji tiḥsukat (titsu° ?) prāṇa 3 anung kinon mahārāja humarěpa ikanang kangan sang pakuwangi pu bañjua anak banua i kaṇ

12. ḍang watak pangkuwangi muang sira tangkil pu wu | ñji anak banua i tērěneh watak tangkil, luir nikanang ininum tuak siddhu, ciñca samangkanang paḍahi tuwung rěgang brėkuk gaṇḍi rāwanahasta sapariskāra ikanang pangan inum paripūrṇa irikanang sorai ping nam tabih (°bėh ?) mangḍi

13. | ri sa(ng) wahuta hyang kudur makalambi masinghėl² wḍihan yu 1 sumangaṣkāra sang hyang watu sima umunggu i sor ning witāna humarěp baitan (wai° ?) umasě sang prākwitaka (°gwi° ?) kabaih umunggu lor ning witāna ikanang patih muang ikanang

14. rā | ma rari matuha laki-laki waduan umunggu kidul ning witāna, saji sang hyang watu sima wḍihan rangga yu 5 mas mā 5 sang hyang brahmā wḍihan rangga yu 1 mas mā 1 bras ring tamwakur sadāngan mas mā 6 wsi urā 5 wsi-wsi

15. prakāra | wadung patuk rimwas lukai tēwėk punukan kulurmi kurumbhāgi³ kris lanḍuk sawiji sowang linggis 5 wangkyul 1 tamwaga prakāra⁴ padyusan tahas saragi paganganan (?)

1. This is an improved reading upon Cohen Stuart's. See *O.J.O.*, p. 266.

2. FS. has °il.

3. Sometimes it is written as *gurum°*.

4. FS. has *sra°*.

16. inuman padamaran¹ sawiji sowang kampil 1 bras pa | da
1 wsi ikat 10 (1?) taṇḍas ning haḍangan 1 kumol 1 caru skul
dinyun papras 2 sali (?) mar tulu(ng ?) paargha pašilih galuh 2
hayam hirēng 5 hantriṇi 5 pañcopacāra glēpung putih kuning²

17. kamwang gandha dhūpa dīpa jnu, nāhan luīr nikanang
saji, winong ta bhaṭāra brahmā pinakadewasākṣi i sang hyang
watu sīma matēhēr mangañjali mamūjā i sang hyang brahmā
manghanākan sāpatha i sang hyang watu sīma ling nira indah
bhaṭāra

18. brahmā sang hyang prithiwī āpya teja bā | yu ākāśa³ lor
kidul kuluan wetan i sor i ruhur sang hyang rahina wngi sang
hyang dewa śukṣma sakwaih ta bhaṭāra kita dewa pramāna yāwat
hana wuang umulahulah ikeng watu sīma

19. patyananyu yadeyanyu | i patiya te panoliha i wuntat te
tinghala i likuran tampyal i wirangan uwahi i tēngannan (kē° ?)
tutuh tuṇḍunya blah kapālanya⁴ sbittakan wtangnya rantan
usūs

20. nya wtukaan ḍalamnya duduk hatinya pangan daging
| nya inum rāhnya tēhēr pēpēḍḍakan wkasakan hawu kerir
tibākan ing mahārorawa klān i kawah sang yama saluīr ni (ng ?)
lara hiḍapannya, kadi lawas sang hyang candraditya sumungluhi⁵

21. andahnuwaua mangkanā lawasnya | n tuakaan sāngsāra
awaknya rabinya anaknya putunya puyutnya anggasnya nāhan
ling nira⁶ panghanākan sapatha matēhēr mamantingakan hantlū
manētēk⁷ gulū ning hayam ling nira

22. indah bhaṭāra kadyanggānike hantlū tan wa | luy i
kurunganya samangkana ikeng hayam tan waluyā matpung galūnya
mangkanā tmahanani kanangguang umulahulah suśuk ning kudur
sāngsārā ataya śakulagotranya kawaih, ikana sang masīma swasthā
dirghāyusa astu (.)

1. FS. has *sa*°.

2. FS. has *tu*°.

3. FS. has *mākā*°.

4. FS. has *ta*°.

5. FS. has *pu*°.

6. FS. has *linira*.

7. FS. has °tēk.

TRANSLATION.

1. 1. Hail! The Śaka year expired, 841, the month of Śrāvaṇa, twelfth day of the bright half of the month, *mawulu*¹, *umanis*², Monday, while the lunar mansion Mūla stood under the deity of Nīrti

2. during the conjunction of Waidhṛti in the South-east. At this time the illustrious great king, | the *raka*³ of Layang, *dyah* Tloḍong⁴, śrī Sajjanasanmatānūrāga (u)t(t) unggadewa marked out the forest at Lintakan (which was) under Malintiki, and the forest at Tuhaḥ (?) under Sinapan (?)⁵. Moreover,

3. there was also the marking out (of a region) | at Wru (which was) under the *magañjar* of the temple-inspector (?). These were in connexion with the foundation of a free-hold. There were also irrigated lands at Kasugihan (measuring) *tampah* 1, in the east of the *lmah*-grounds of Tuhaḥ and of Lintakan. These were now bought

1. The day of the six-day week.

2. The day of the five-day week.

3. *Raka* may be = lord, i. e., Skt. *Swāmī*. Thus *rake* (*raka* + *i*) *Kayuwangi* = the lord of Kayuwangi, etc.

4. While remarking on *dyah* Balitung (*TBG*, 67, p. 181), Dr. Stutterheim equated the words with 'Prince (of) Billiton' (?) and mentioned the parallel of 'Prince of Wales.' In the latter case, however, the 'of' has been explicitly stated. If we have, for example, 'Prince Henry' we shall never equate the words with 'Prince of Henry.' Hence, we may translate *dyah* Balitung by 'Prince (viz.) Balitung, and *dyah* Tloḍong by 'Prince (viz.) Tloḍong.' So these alternative translations are equally possible and we cannot be certain regarding any one of them. We may, however, see in these examples, first the title of the King, then the Indonesian proper name and lastly his Sanskrit or Indian name.

5. Such as FS. shows, we may as well read this name as Pi°. If so, this will immediately remind us of the *samagga* Pinapan, mentioned in the *jayapāttra* of 849 Śaka. See *TBG*, XXXII, pp. 98-149.

Secondly, the passage seems to show that forests were crown-property. This becomes more clear, when we consider the fact that in the list of royal officers, we find a class of people called *tuha alas*, i. e., Superintendent of the forest.

4. by the illustrious great king from the headman of (the village of) Kasugihan | for silver 1 *karṣa*¹ 13 *dharāṇa*² 6 *māṣa*³. These were then accordingly marked out into free-holds with the object of offering *caru* to the *caitya* of the father of the illustrious great king (cremated) at Turumangambil*. The *lmah*-grounds (which)

5. were marked out, were the *lmah*-grounds to the South of Tarus (and) these are to be protected by the *mamrāti* (and) the *tīlīmpik*. | Moreover, in consequence of the coming of all the *taṇḍa rakryān*-s⁵, they were given presents in ample measure with their messengers (*parujar*) (and), according to custom, the free-hold was completely marked out (and) was confirmed for the most remote future (i. e., for ages).

6. These are the reasons for such of the contents of | the edict (*praśasti*). All the *taṇḍa rakryān*-s received (gifts) in ample measure, according to the custom of marking out free-holds. (Thus) the (*rakryān*) *hino* of the time (viz.) *Pu Ketudhara*⁶, a lord (*prabhu*) having the brilliance of jewels and the prowess of Trivikrama (i. e. Viṣṇu)⁷, (received) *pilih magēng*-cloth 1 set and gold 1 *suvarṇa* and 4 *māsa*. The *raka* of *halu* (viz.)

7. | *Pu Siṇḍok*, the *raka* of *sirikan* (viz) *Pu Hawang*, the *raka* of *wka* (viz) *Pu Kiraṇa*, received *Kalyāga*-cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. The *mamrāti* (viz) *Pu Ḍapit* (and) the *tīlīmpik* (viz) *Pu Paṇḍamuan* received

8. *ambay-ambay*-cloth 1 set | (and) gold 4 *māṣa*, each in particular. The *samgat momahumah* of Pikatan (viz.) *Pu Kamba-*

1. 1 *Karṣa* = 16 *māṣa*.

2. 1 *Dharāṇa* = $\frac{2}{3}$ *karṣa*.

3. 1 *Māṣa* = $\frac{1}{16}$ *suvarṇa* or *karṣa*.

4. This translation has been possible after the ingenious emendation of the text by Dr. Poerbatjaraka. See his *Agastyā*, p. 77.

5. Principal officers.

6. Dr. Krom suggests (*Geschiedenis*², pp. 189-90) that 'Ketudhara' and 'vijaya' are not different persons. It is also possible that he is identical with King Wawa (924-27 A. D.). See *TBG*, 70, p. 183.

7. It appears from these titles, particularly from the use of *hino* and *prabhu*, that he was a prince of the blood royal. He might not, of course, be a Vaiṣṇavite prince.

ladhara received *sulasih*-cloth 1 set (and) gold 8 *māṣa*. The *tiruan* (viz.) *Pu Cakra* received

9. *ambay-ambay*-cloth 1 set and gold 5 *māṣa*. The *halaran* (viz.) *Pu Wihikan*, | the *palarhyang* (temple-priest?) (viz.) *Pu Balandung*, the *dalinan* (viz.) *Pu Parbwata*, the *manghūri* (viz.) *Pu Teja*, the *pangkur*¹ (viz.) *Pu Jayanta*, the *tawān* (viz.) *Pu Sena*, the *tirip* (viz.) *Pu Hariwangsa*, the *wadihati* (viz.) *Pu Manggala*, the *makudur* (viz.) *Pu Dhanuka*,—all received *ambay-ambay*-cloth

10. 1 set and gold 4 *māsa*, each | in particular. The officer of Sinapan (?), having lands in Tunah (viz.) *Sang Pangganuan* received *ambay-ambay*-cloth 1 set (and) gold 8 *māṣa*. The *manglintaki* (viz.) *Pu Sawitra* received 1 piece of cotton cloth. Two chiefs (*tuhān*) of the *wadihati*:

11. *miramirah* (viz.) *Pu Sudanta*, | resident of *Miramirah*, (and) *mangrangkapi lēbur poh* (viz.) *Pu Wikasita*, resident of *Ḍatar* under *Ḍatar*; two chiefs (*tuhān*) of the *makudur*: *lingo* (viz.) *Sang Manghandul*, resident of *Kinaling* under the jurisdiction of the queen² (and) *mangrangkapi* (viz.) *Sang Manglage*, resident

12. of *Pulung* | under *makudur*; the *wahuta hyang kudur*; the *lumaku manusuk*³ of the *wadihati* (viz.) *Sang Wada*, resident of *Sumbhāgi* under *Pangrēmban* (?); (the *lumaku manusuk*) of the *makudur* (viz.) *Sang Mangantus*, resident of *Jurungan* under *Pagar wēsi*; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold

13. 4 *māṣa*, | each in particular. The messenger (*parujar*) of *hino*: *kaṇḍamuhi* (viz.) *Sang Kasura* (?), resident of *Wungkuḍu* under *Kilisan* (°pa° ?); the messenger (*parujar*) of *halu*: *wisāga* (viz.) *Sang*⁴ *Widyānidhi*, resident of *Hilyan* under

1. *Pangkur*, *tawān* and *tirip* are described in the Kalasan inscription as *ādēśasastrin*, which may mean bodyguards (?)

2. Following *Kaḍatuan*. Of *Binihaji*, i. e., Queen, *bini*=*bi*+Mal.-Polynesian infix *in*. So *binihaji* should lit. mean 'the one who has been made wife of the King.'

3. That this is an official title (apparently in connexion with the marking out of the free-hold) appears clearly from *OJO XXXI*, V° 8.

4. The text should thus be emended.

14. Padlagan ; the scribe of the *hino* of Pangujaran : *wu | ng kal waraṇi* (viz.) *Sang Śuddha*, resident of the cloister at Kamyang in Jantur ; the messenger (*parujar*) of *sirikan* : *hujung galuh*¹ (viz.) *Sang Tatwa*, resident of Srāngan under Srāngan ; the messenger (*parujar*) of *wēka* : *wiridiḥ* (viz.) *Sang Kirtadhara*,

15. resident of Huntu under Pu | taddhaṇu ; the messenger (*Parujar*) of *Tiruan* : *Sumuḍan* (viz.) *Sang Prāḥṇa*, resident of the cloister at Siddhakāryya belonging to Dīhyang, the place of flowers and water ; the messenger

16. (*parujar*) of *halaran* (viz.) *Sang Adigama*, resident of Jahayan | under *halu* ; the messenger (*parujar*) of the *palarhyang* (temple-priest ?) (viz.) *Sang Mañca*, resident of Sumuḍa under Eḍḅangan (?) ; the messenger (*parujar*) of *dalīnan* (viz.) *Sang Trisaraṇa*, resident of Muntang under Upit ; the messenger (*parujar*) of *pangkur* : *didēlan*² :

1. In Old-Javanese inscriptions, so far as I know, *Hujung galuh* has twice been used as the name of a place. I am referring to the Kēlagen inscription of King Airlangga, where we read (*OJO*, p. 135), *bhāṇḍa ri hujung galuh* and *ri hujung galuh ikang* and in the Amsterdam inscription of Balitung. In all other places, the phrase indicates a class of officers of the lower category. Scholars have unfortunately neglected the unambiguous testimony of *KO* XVII, l. 14 where *hujung galuh* has been grouped under the people called *mamuat ujar*, i.e., 'bearer of words.' Thus we read there, ".....*sang mamuat ujar* : *kaṇḍamuhi* (viz.) *ḍapunta* Widyānidhi ; *watu waraṇi* (viz.) *Pu Manghalangi* ; *wisāga* (viz.) *Pu Wiryya* ; *hujung galuh* (viz.) *Pu Kacat*....." On a different occasion Dr. Bosch remarked (*OV*, 1925, p. 48), "It appears that *tuhan mamuat ujar* or *parujar* forms a lower category of officers, in service to the high dignitaries. In the list of *parujars* are taken the three *citralekha-s* (scribes) : *watu waraṇi*, *dharmmasinta* and *halang manuk* who also signed the *praśasti* (Kēmbang Arum inscription). They appear to be similar in rank with the *parujar-s*. They were included in the list of messengers probably because they are also, in a sense, 'bearer of words.' At any rate, the association of *hujung galuh* with *parujar* or *mamuat ujar* is unmistakable. In this sense of ours, *hujung galuh* is mentioned in *OJO*, p. 45 (ll 4-5 V°) p. 65 (l. 11 V°), p. 78 (ll. 1-2), p. 94 (ll. 28, 32) and in several other places. See also Rouffaer, *BKI*, 77 (1921) p. 364.

2. Cohen Stuart gives the alternative reading of *ḍēḍḍ*. This is found in *KO* XVII, 15.

17. *Sang* | Adik, resident of Rakadut under Rannyā (?); the messenger (*paruġar*) of *habāngan*¹ : *aluk* (viz.) *Sang* Nirmmala, resident of Manggulungi under Manggulungi; the messenger (*paruġar*) of *tirip* (viz.) *Sang* Ṣtangġil (?), resident

2, 1. of | Mataram, the place of precious metals, under Kahulunan; the messenger (*paruġar*) of *mamrati* : *turuhan* (viz.) Hawang Ananta resident of Kabanyāgān in Galuh² ;

2. the messenger (*paruġar*) of *tilimpik* : *wka-wka* (viz.) *Si* Pawana, resident of | Wuga under Pĕar; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. The scribe of *mamrati* : *kĕrĕp* (viz.) *Sang* Ludra, resident of Mandahi under Mandahi; the scribe of *tilimpik* : *patilaman* (viz.) *Sang* Ladwāngga (?),

3. | resident of Kahuripan under Pagar wĕsi; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. The *wahuta* of *mamrati* : *prih* (viz.) *Si* Godhā, resident of Talaga under Mamrati; the *wahuta* of *tilim-*

4. *pik* : *jukuter* | (viz.) *Si* Dewa, resident of Wĕrĕhĕnya under *tilimpik*; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *māṣa*, each in particular. The *pihujung* of *pangkur* (viz.) *Si* Nanda, resident of Lua under Lua; the *pihu-*

5. *jung* of *tawān* (viz.) Lua Sukan, resident of Lua | under Tañjung; the *pihujung* of *tirip* (viz.) Panawungan, resident of Panawungan under Tirip; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 piece (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. The *wahuta* of *kahulunan* : *dumling turuy* (viz.) *Si* Bikrma, resident of Sĕkar

6. ambay | under Tangar; the *patih*³ of Gilikan (viz.) *Si* Muñdi, father⁴ of Wagad; the *patih* of Tigang sugih (viz.) *Si*

1. Cohen Stuart doubted this reading, but the FS. is not indistinct on this point. Besides, this official appears in *KO XV*, b 2.

2. Galuh (?) in *OJO XXVIII*. cf. also Galuh in *Charita Parahyangan* (*TBG*, 59, p. 416); also cf. *TBG*, 67, p. 197 and fn. 59.

3. The *patih* of these places is a petty officer and not like the great officers (*mahāmantri*).

4. *Rāma* means either 'father' or the 'officer of a village.' There is yet no criterion to decide which meaning has to be accepted in particular cases. An observation of a large number of instances has however led me to the view that when the word *rāma* occurs before the name (with

Cakër, father of Ratha ; the *patih* of Panggil (viz.) *Si* Balikuh ; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular.

7. All their wives received 1 piece | of undercloth for women, each in particular. The messenger (*parujar*) of the *patih* of Gilikan (viz.) Sawahu¹, father of Dungis ; the messenger (*parujar*) of Tigang sugih (viz.) *Si* knoh, father of Wanayī ; the messenger (*parujar*) of the *patih* of Panggil (viz.) *Si* Wěřě (?) father of Taśah (?) ; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 piece (and) gold 2 *kupang*², each in particular. Tue *rāma māg*-

8. *man* (?) | of Kaśugihan : *kalang*³ (viz.) *Si* Balawo (?), father of Rawi ; the older of the village (*tuha wanua*) (viz.) *Si* Jalung (?), father of Gunu (?) ; the six (?) *gusti*-s⁴ : *Si* Padma (who is) father of Wěřěl, *Si* Ranggěl (who is) father of Bukat, *Si* Anggirā (who is) father of Lalatī, *Si* Rěṣi (who is) father of Pahing, *Si* Jambhala (who is) father of Gayuk, the proxy (*winkas*)⁵ (viz.) *Si* Kěpu,

9. father of Gěyak ; (all these) received | coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. All their wives

pu, mpu, si, etc.), it should be translated by 'the officer of the village ;' in other cases, by 'father.' The reading of Old-Javanese inscriptions also shows that the official title of the person in question is placed first, then appears his proper name and lastly words indicative of his social status. Judging from this point of view, the remarks of Dr. Bosch (*OV*, 1925, p. 45) over Lucira have been misapplied. I have always kept this general principle before my view.

1. I suppose that *Sa(ng)* Wahu has been intended here.

2. 1 *Kupang* = $\frac{1}{2}$ *mās*.

3. Or, ".....of Kasugihan ; the Kalang....."

4. In Bali, *gusti* = *Vaisya*. That is not probably intended here. In the following enumeration we find that the *winkas*, i. e., the proxy has been included in the list of *gusti*-s. This shows that the *Vaisya* is not intended here. This will be more evident from b. 11 below, where we shall not only find the *winkas* again included in the list of the *gusti*-s but also the *tuha banua*. The *gusti* is, therefore, in all probability, a petty village functionary.

5. In the *Inscription of Papringan*, published by Dr. Stutterheim in *TBG*, 73, pp. 99—100, the word has been translated by him as proxy, substitute. Kern (*VG*, VII, p. 21) translated it by 'clerk.'

received 1 piece of under-cloth for women, each in particular. The astrologer¹ (*vix.*) *Si* Parasi, father of Wugël; the two messengers (*paruĵar*) : *Si* Bamaņa (who is) the father of Nek (and) *Si* Běkyah (who is) the father of Pacang (?); (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set

10. (and) gold 6 *kupang*, | each in particular. All their wives received 1 piece of under-cloth for women, each in particular. The *rāma maratā*-s : *Si* Tanggul (who is) father of Ḍulang (and) *Si* Narā (who is) father of Gawul, received gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular.

11. The *kalang* of Lintakan (*vix.*) *Si* Kuñjar, father of Subhi; the six *gusti*-s : *Si* | Kayuara (who is) the father of Kěpu, *Si* Wěgil (who is) the father of Warangan, *Si* Dewa, *Si* Bayatū (who is) the father of Cabur (?), the older of the village (*tuha banua*) (*vix.*) *Si* Mahi (who is) the father of Baśri, the proxy (*winkas*) (*vix.*) *Si* Guwinda (who is) the father of Jo; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each

12. in particular. All their wives | received 1 piece of under cloth for women, each in particular. The two messengers (*paruĵar*) : *Si* Śanti (who is) the father of Mangiring (and) *Si* Lakṣaņa (who is) the father of Kamwing (?), received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. All their wives received 1 piece of under cloth for women, each in

13. particular. The astrologer (*wariga*) : *Si* Samwi (?), | father of Ti, received 1 piece of coloured cloth (and) gold 2 *kupang*. Further, the astrologer (*wariga*) : father² of Kěsil; the irrigation-inspector (*huler*)³ : *Si* Jawa, father of Bari; the six (?) *tuha wěřěh*-s⁴ : *Si* Gomanta (who is) the father of Pahěhan, *Si* Wahu (who is) the father of Waluh, *Si* Janggi, *Si* Rěgik (who is) the father of Buddhi;

1. So I should like to translate the title of *wariga*.

2. The name of this astrologer seems to have been left out due to the carelessness of the copyist.

3. See *TBG*, 73, pp. 99-100.

4. We have probably to read 'four *tuha wěřěh*-s.' *Tuha wěřěh* is the 'chief over the young (unmarried ?) persons.' Dr. Goris says (*TBG*, 70, p. 164)

14. the temple-inspector¹ (*marhyang*) of Dīhyang² (*viz.*) *Sang Bilut*, | father of Wajang; the temple-inspector (*marhyang*) of Jamwu (*viz.*) *Si Candra*, father of Waḍi; the temple-inspector (*marhyang*) of Samaḍi (*viz.*) *punta Unes* (?); the temple-inspector (*marhyang*) of Putar (?) (*viz.*) *Si Wawuat*, father of Mañcing; the *tañjèn* of kalang (*viz.*) *Si Tguh*, father of Nḍikan; the *raṇḅ apantiḷ* (*viz.*) *Si Pu-*

15. lakas, father of Baddha (?); the *rāma matuha*³ (*viz.*) *Si Mahi*, | father of Limwang; the *rāma maratā* (*viz.*) *Sang Kalyāna* father of Tapa; all (of them) received gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. The *kalang* of Tunah (*viz.*) *Si Mēwohok*, father of Krānta; the three⁴ *gusti-s*: *Si Añjing* (who is) the father of Ndurukan, *Si Lēga* (who is) the father of Nandaka,

16. | *Si Pañjol* (who is) the father of Baśu, the older of the village (*tuha banua*) (*viz.*) *Si Sarwwa* (who is) the father of Prahana, the proxy (*winkas*) (*viz.*) *Si Gujil* (who is) the father of Towana; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. All their wives received 1 piece of undercloth for women,

17. each in particular. The two messengers (*paruḡar*): | *Si Tarah* (?), father of Mēḍang⁵ (and) the officer of the village (*rāma*)

that in the temples of North Bali up to the present day, visitors are divided as (1) adult men, (2) married women, (3) unmarried youths and (4) unmarried girls. The *tuha wěŕěh* stood over such group. Here also the number is four. In the enumeration of names in our text, only four persons have been noted. That is also noteworthy. After these *tuha wěŕěh-s*, four temple-priests or temple-inspectors have been mentioned. They should also be considered in this connexion.

1. The meaning of this word is not certain. He may also be the temple-priest. Till more suitable explanation is forthcoming, we may translate this word by temple-inspector. See also Stutterheim in *TBG*, 73, pp. 99-100, *s.v. marhyang*.

2. This is the old name of the well-known Dieng.

3. The head of the elders ?

4. Probably we have to read 'five'. As a matter of fact, five persons have been enumerated.

5. Our view regarding *rāma* confirms the remark of Stutterheim in *TBG*, 67, p. 193, f.n. 43.

of Ayi¹, received coloured cloth 1 set and gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. All their wives received 1 piece of undercloth for women, each in particular. The astrologer (*wariga*) *Si* Buru, father of Mundiki, received 1 piece of coloured cloth (and)

18. gold 2 *kupang*. The *pawah* | (of the) astrologer (*wariga*) (*viz.*) *Si* Bāma, father of Uḍuh; the irrigation-inspector (*huler*) (*viz.*) *Si* Mukmuk, father of Ṇdokoh; the two *tuha wērēh-s* (*viz.*) *Si* Mangalap (and) *Si* Hunur; the *rāma maratā* (s): *Si* Wada, the grandfather of Wangi (and) *Si* Měbēyěng, father of Kupu; (all these) re-

19. ceived gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. The *kalang* of Wra (*viz.*) *Si* Ges, | father of Bining (?); the six² *gusti-s*: *Si* Kēwah (who is) the father of Kēpu, *Si* Wangah, *Si* Garjita, *Si* Pañjol (who is) the father of Cangkak, the older of the village (*viz.*) *Si* Lakwan (who is) the father of Kucyak, the proxy (*winkas*) (*viz.*) *Si* Palaku; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*,

20. each in particular. All their | wives received 1 piece of undercloth for women, each in particular. The two messengers (*parujar*): *Si* Lěwě (?) (who is) the father of Bari (and) *Si* Lutung (who is) the father of Puṇḍuk, received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. All their wives received 1 piece of under-cloth for women,

3. 1. | each in particular. The astrologer (*wariga*) (*viz.*) *Si* Garu (who is) the father of Samwī received 1 piece of cloth (and) gold 2 *kupang*. The irrigation-inspector (*huler*) (*viz.*) *Si* Luka, father of Ḍaha, received gold 2 *kupang*. The officers of neighbouring villages who went to stand as witnesses at the foundation of the

2. free-hold: the officers of the village of Sawyan (?) (*viz.*) the *gusti* (who is) *Si* Anggu, father of Gilēh |; the *kalang* (who is) *Si* Nek, father of Dalihan; the messenger (*parujar*) (who is) *Si* Luting, father of Ḍngil. The officer of the village of Luītan: the *kalang* (*viz.*) *Si* Hiri, father of Datti; the two messengers

1. His name might have been omitted for the carelessness of the scribe.

2. The *gusti-s* appear to have formed something like a board or committee. From other inscriptions, however, it appears that their number was not fixed.

(*parujar*): *Si Kaṭu* (?), father of Kuśala, (and) *Si Dagū*, father of Blyah; the *kalang* of Tigang Sugih (*viz.*) *Si Sungkul* (?),

3. father of Koḍo; the *gusti* (*viz.*) | *Si Kuring*, father of Balam; the messenger (*parujar*) (*viz.*) *Si Kēḍangan*; the *kalang* of Parang (*viz.*) *Si Bětah*, father of Tarima; the older of the village (*tuha banua*) (*viz.*) *Si Kanti*, grandfather of Bhawita; the messenger (*parujar*) (*viz.*) *Si Datang*, father of Barubuh; the older of the village (*tuha banua*) of Gilikan (*viz.*) *Si Kalamwuay*; the two messengers (*parujar*) (*viz.*) *Si Hṛng* (who is) the father of

4. Dungas (and) *Si Knoh* | (who is) the father of Wanayī; the *kalang* of Kalawukan (*viz.*) *Si Gaṇa*, father of Darā; the *gusti* (*viz.*) *Si Tarkha*, father of Godhi; the messenger (*parujar*) (*viz.*) *Si Glo*. All these *Kalang*-s, *gusti*-s, elders (*tuha banua*-s) of neighbouring villages received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. All the messengers

5. (*parujar*) | received coloured cloth 1 piece (and) gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. The officers of the village of Turumangamwil who went to stand as witnesses: *Si Waraṇa*, father of Bhukti; the *kalang* (*viz.*) *Si Arta*, father of Dhyāna; (all these) received coloured cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *kupang*, each in particular. (All) their wives

6. | received 1 piece of undercloth of women, each in particular. The messenger (*parujar*) (*viz.*) *Si Padma* received coloured cloth 1 piece (and) gold 2 *kupang*. Evenso, the young, male (or) female, received their share of silver (which was) one *atak* (and) one *kupang*, per head¹.

7. The slaves² received (their reward) according to (their) ability (lit., physique). The *atapukan*-s who went to the foundation of | the free-hold: *Si Rahulu*, father of Mariṣa (?), resident of Paḡlutan under Tiru ranu; *Si Marūm*, father of Tarima, resident of Kahutanan under Mataram; *Si Piñjungan*, father of Namwi, resident of

1. cf. Kern, *VG*, VII, p. 45.

2. By *wsi*, I think *anaḥ wsi*, i. e., slaves have been intended.

8. Mangēwēl under Anggul (?); *Si* Patanghuran, resident | of Wēngkal¹ under Dalinan; *Si* Balilu, resident of Paniruan under Panggil hyang; *Si* Bisama, resident of Pakalangkyangan under Pagar wsi; *Si* Lamayung, resident of Watuwatu under Watuwatu. The total number of

9. *atapukan-s* | (*vix.*) 3² persons, the *hop* (*an-s* ?)³ (and) the young, all together, received silver 1 *dharāṇa*. Their *tarimwa-s* received silver 1 *māṣa*, all together. The *pininang-s*⁴ of the *mawuaya*⁵ of Marēbung and of Wulang received silver 8 *māṣa*, per village. Moreover, *Sang* Wīrēh (?) of Kaśugihan (who)

10. | went to supply water (?)⁶ received silver 2 *māṣa*. Thereafter was completed the (distribution of) gifts in ample measure and *saji*-offerings. All of them (then) went to the *lmah*-grounds at Kunahwāhu (?)⁷ which was marked out into a free-hold. They (then) placed themselves in the festal tent (and) they ate (and) drank (and) took unguents and perfumes. They (then) removed themselves (and) made toilette with paints and flowers, one by one.

11. | Four buffaloes valued at silver 5 *dharāṇa* 8 *māṣa*, each, (and) three *ūkṣukat* (?)⁸, which were sent by the great king, were

1. Stutterheim (*TBG*, 67, p. 183) provisionally brings this place-name in connexion with Wēngkali of the *Nāg*: 3 : 1-4. I think he is right, because Pilanggu is also met with in records of Central Java.

2. The number has evidently been wrong, for the number is 7 and not 3.

3. I am not sure if the well-known class of persons called *hoṣan* is intended here. *Hop* occurs several times in Old-Jav. inscriptions after the numerals, whether in land-measurement or elsewhere.

4. Assistants ?

5. Water-suppliers ?

6. This should be the etymological meaning from *wuay* = *wuay*, i. e. water.

7. Probably we have to read Tu°. This appears to be the full name of the village in Pl. I, 3. The mention of only the first half of the name of the village is not strange, for, we have already the testimony of the inscription of Kēdu, published by Stutterheim in *TBG*, 67, pp. 172-215. In Pl. A, 3, the name of the village is written as *Kuning Kagunturan*; in I, 7 of the same plate, it is simply *Kuning*.

8. I do not know what animal is intended hereby.

presented to everyone of them (*i.e.* for all of them). The Hon. *Pakuwangi* (*vix.*) *Pu Bañjua*, resident of Kaṇ-

12. ḍang under Pakuwangi and the Hon. *tangkil* (*vix.*) *Pu Wu* | ṅjī, resident of Těřěñěh under *tangkil*; all of them drank *tuak*¹, *sīdhu*² and *ciñca*-wine. Even so, the drummers, *tuwung*³-players, cymbal-players, *brėkuk*⁴-players, *gaṇḍi*⁵-players, *rāwanahasta*⁶-players. After the passing off of the evening time, at six hour, stood up

13. | the *wahuta hyang kudur* with a jacket, skirt (and) 1 set of cloth to consecrate the sacred *watu sima* (*i.e.*, the foundation-stone), and placed himself under the tent facing the east. All the Hon. judges went forward and placed themselves in the north of the tent. The *patih*-s, (and) the

14. officers of villages, | young and old, male and female, placed themselves in the South of the tent. The offerings (*saji*) for the sacred *watu sima* are : coloured cloth 5 sets and gold 5 *māṣa* ; (for) *Brahmā*⁷ 1 set of coloured cloth (of the value of ?) 1 *māṣa* ; uncooked rice in a bowl ; one cooking pot ; gold 6 *māṣa* ; *wěsi urā*, 5 ; other kinds of iron objects :

15. | axe, mattock, plane, curved chopper, dagger, grass-cutter, *kulumi*⁸, *kurumbhāgi*⁹, *kris*¹⁰, chopping knife, one of each kind ; crowbar, 5 ; hoe, 1 ; kinds of copper objects : washing basin, *tahas*, cooking bowl,

1. A kind of palm-wine.
2. A kind of 'rum.
3. A kind of musical instrument of the form of a basin.
4. Evidently a kind of musical instrument.
5. A class of musicians.

6. If etymology is a guide, *rāwanahasta* should be a class of musicians who raise music by striking palms of hands. This reminds me of some reliefs on the walls of Barabudur where we find persons of this very description in a musical party. See plate in *BKI*, 92, p. 188.

7. The god of Fire has been intended here.
8. In some inscriptions it is written as *gu*^o.
9. Elsewhere *gu*^o.

10. The well-known Indonesian dagger.

16. drinking basin, lamp, one of each kind ; sack, 1 ; uncooked rice, | 1 *pada*¹ ; iron, 10 (1 ?) *ikat*² ; head of a buffalo, 1 ; *kumol*, 1 ; offerings of cooked rice in bowls, 2 dishes ; *salimar* (?), *tulung* (?)³ ; water for washing feet* ; semi-precious metals, 2 ; black hens, 5 ; eggs, 5 ; five necessary things for offering (*viz.* ?)⁵ white and yellow flour,

17. flower, scent, frankincense, lamp and paints. Now all these offerings | were presented to god Brahmā who stood as a divine witness of the sacred *watu sīma*. Thereupon he (*i.e.* *wahuta kudur*), with joint-palms, offered respects to god Brahmā and uttered curses before the sacred *watu sīma*. His words were : "Be gracious, O god

18. Brahmā, the divine earth, water, light, wind, | ether, north, south, west, east, (the deities) of the nether-region (and) of zenith, the sacred day and night, the invisible gods, all dead kings (*bhaṭāra*)⁶, you all deities, come to witness ! If there is any one who disturbs the *watu sīma*,

19. he may be killed by you, | he may die through your action without his (finding time to) turn behind, without (his finding time to) looked behind. He may be struck in the left side, then again in the right side. His mouth may be smashed, his forehead may be broken, his belly may be ripped open, his bowels may be rooted

20. out, his entrails may be drawn out, his heart may be pulled out, his flesh may be eaten up, | his blood may be sucked up,

1. *Pada* may mean 'type, sort, kind.' If so, the translation may be 'uncooked rice of one sort.'

2. The text has *wēsi ikat* which may stand for the name of an article I do not know. Can *ikat* indicate a measurement ?

3. The text has *salimar tulu(ng ?)*, whereof the latter word may denote a kind of *caru*.

4. *Paargha* is obviously the corrupted form of *Pā(dy)ārgha*.

5. In the following enumeration, six things have been summed up and hence *pañcopacāra* need not be taken here in too literal a sense. In some other inscriptions, however, 'white and yellow flower' has been omitted, thus making the things numbered five.

6. *cf.* the remarks of Stutterheim in *TBG*, 67, p. 188.

thereupon he may be trampled. Lastly his ashes may be blown away (and) thrown into the *mahāraura*-hell to be cooked in the hell-pan of god Yama ! He may experience all sorts of (such) sorrows ! So long as the deities Moon and Sun light up

21. the earth-ball, during this | period, he himself, his wife, his children, his grand-children, his great-grand-children, his great-great-grand-children, shall be afflicted with sorrows ! So were his words describing the oaths. Thereupon he smashed the egg (and) separated the neck of the hen. His words were :

22. "Be gracious, O Gods ! Just as the part of the egg cannot return | to the shell, just as the hen can not return and be united with its neck, so shall be the sad fate of him who will disturb the foundation of the *Kudur* : with all his family and relations he will be afflicted with sorrows and destroyed ! (But) the owner of the free-hold shall be happy and long-living ! Amen¹ !

P. S. As the facsimile was compared at the time of proof-reading, my difference from the previous editor will be noted in my *Corpus Inscriptionum Javanarum*, Vol. I.

1. I have come across similar imprecatory verses in Indian Sanskrit literature and inscriptions. But so far as I have seen, the statements are not exactly identical. Below is quoted the relevant portion from the Chiplun plates of Pulakesin II (*EL*, III, p. 53) :

"The giver of land enjoys happiness in heaven for sixty-thousand years ; (but) the confiscator (of a grant) and he who assents to (an act of confiscation) shall dwell for the same number of years in hell ! O Yudhiṣṭhira, best of kings, carefully preserve land that has previously been given to the twice-born ; (verily) the preservation (of a grant) is more meritorious than making a grant ! Whosoever confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another,—he is born as a worm in ordure, and is consumed together with (his) deceased ancestors ! Those grants, productive of religion and wealth and fame, which have been formerly given here (on earth) by (previous) kings (are) like worn-out garlands ; verily, what good man would take them back again ? He who grants land (whether simply) ploughed (or) planted with seed (or) full of crops,—he is treated with honour in heaven, for as long as the worlds, created by the Sun, endure !"

For similar other examples, reference may be made to *EL*, III, pp. 133, 146, 224 ; *IA*, XVI, p. 134 ; Fleet, *CII*, Nos. 26-28, 30-31. See also *Skandapuṭṭa*, *uttarakhaṇḍa*, 22 : 33 ff.

APPENDIX

**List of officers and classes of people¹ referred to
in the Inscription.**

Aluk	Marhyang
Anurat	Mawuaya
Atapukan	Miramirah
Brëkuk	Paḍahi
Dalinar	Pagar wësi
Didëlan	Pakuwangi
Dumling turuy	Palarhyang
Gaṇḍi	Pangkur
Gusti	Parujar
Habāngan	Patih
Halaran	Patilaman
Halu	Pawah
Hino	Pihujung
Hujung galuh	Pininang
Huler	Prih
Jukuter	Raka
Kahulunan	Rakryan
Kalang	Rāma
Kaṇḍamuhi	Rāma māgman
Kërëp	Rāma maratā
Lingo	Rāma matuha
Lumaku manusuk	Raṇë apantil
Makudur	Rāwanahasta
Magañjar	Rëgang
Mamrati	Samgat momahumah
Manghuri	Sirikan
Manglintaki	Sumuḍan
Mangrangkapi	Taṇḍa rakryan
Mangrangkapi lëbur poh	Tañjën

1. Where names of places and titles could not be distinguished, I avoided them from the above list.

Tarimwa	Wadihati
Tawan	Wahuta
Tilimpik	Wahuta hyang kudur
Tirip	Wariga
Tiruan	Winkas
Tuhan	Wiridih
Tuha wanua (banua)	Wisāga
Tuha wěreh	Wka-wka
Turuhan	Wungkal waraṇi
Tuwung	



SOME SIDE-LIGHTS ON THE NUSAIRIS.*

SIRAJUL HAQQ, M. A.

Dept. of Arabic & Islamic Studies.

The Nusairis have been the cause of a number of theories¹. Scholars like De Sacy², René Dussaud³, René Basset⁴ and the historian Benjamin⁵ have dealt with their doctrines and movements but they have not been able to discover the exact date of their origin. Ibn Ḥazm⁶ and al-Shahrastānī⁷ also are silent on this point. The

* Synopsis of a lecture delivered at a meeting of the Arabic and Islamic Studies Association, Dacca University on the 9th of March, 1935.

The writer is deeply indebted to Prof. J. W. Fück and Dr. K. R. Qanungo for their valuable assistance in preparing the lecture.

(1) For a few theories on the etymology of the name as well as for the present-day religion of the Nuṣairis see Hastings, *Enc. of Religion and Ethics*, IX, 417sq.

(2) *Exposé de la Religion des Druzes*, II, 559-586.

(3) *Histoire et Religion des Nosairis* (Paris 1900). In his opinion they are the Alides among the Shīas.

(4) *Enc. of Religion and Ethics*. s.v. Nuṣairis. In his opinion they are a nation called Anṣārīya who live even now in the mountainous country, north of Lebanon between ancient Eleutherus, the Orontes and the Mediterranean coast. They founded colonies in Antioch, Mersina, Tarsus and Adana which are very prosperous with a population of 150,000. Basset divides them into 4 classes: (I) The Haidaris, (II) the Shamalis, (III) the Kalaziz and (IV) the Ghaibis.

(5) *Persia and the Persians* (London 1885) p. 352 sq.

(6) *The Zahirite*, b. 384/994 and d. 456/1063. For his biography see *Enc. of Islam* s.v. Ibn Ḥazm. D.B. Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology* etc, pp. 208sqq.

(7) Abul Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Shahrastānī, the principal historian of the religions in the oriental middle ages b. In *Shahrastān* in Khorasan in 469/1076 and d. in 548/1153. *Enc. of Islām* IV, 263.

former says¹ that the Nusairiya is a party belonging to the *Sabbābiya* sect (of the Shias) who cursed Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet and Ḥasan and Ḥusain, the two sons of 'Alī, while the latter informs² us that the Nuṣairis as well as the Ishaqians are from among the *Ghulāt al-Shī'a* (the extreme Shias) who believe in incarnation and declare that God emanated into human beings, and that when after the death of the Prophet there remained none better than 'Alī and his selected descendants, God manifested Himself in their persons and spoke through their tongues. According to the popular theory it is Muhammad b. Nuṣair who founded a sect called Nuṣairiya. But René Basset opposes this theory and says, on supposition, that the Nuṣairis are either connected with Nuṣair, a freedman of 'Alī or with Ansars of the Prophet. This theory, then, would prove that the Nuṣairis came into existence even in the first century A.H. But if we look into an excellent article in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, (Vol. VIII, article No. VI, 1864) by Edward Salisbury, who discovers the mysteries of the Nuṣairian religion from a rare and precious book, *Kitāb Bakūrat al-Sulaimāniya fī Kashf Asrār al-Diyāna al-Nuṣairiyya*³ by Sulaimān Efendi al-Adhānī, we understand that the sect undoubtedly originated at the end of the 3rd. century A.H. with one Abū Shu'aib Muhammad b. Nuṣair al-'Abdī al-Bakrī al-Numairī, a fanatical adherent of the 11th 'Alide Imām Ḥasan al-'Askarī who died in 260/873*.

I now propose to deal with some glimpses of strange and peculiar beliefs of this sect in the light of accounts available in the

(1) *Al-Fiṣal fī'l-Milal wa'l Ahwā' wa'n Niḥal*, pr. Cairo 1317-21.

(2) *Milal wa'n Niḥal*, (Leipzig 1923) I, 143-145.

(3) In it we come across a few doctrinal formulae of the Nuṣairis in an scriptural arrangement consisting of 16 Suras (chapters). The book further deals with some of their peculiar festivals and prayers, and a doctrinal tract named *al-Habīyah* (the fall) forms the last chapter of this book.

(4) J.A.O.S. VIII, 236/5 ; 243/14 ; cf. H. Lammens, *L' Islam*, p. 187. He says ; La secte renonte a un certain Ibn Nosair. C'était un partisan exalté du onzième imam 'alide, Hasan al-'askari mort en 873.

writings¹ of Ibn Taimiyya², the great reformer of Islām of the 8th century A. H.

Like Ibn Ḥazm and Shahrastānī³ our author is quite silent about the date of the origin of the Nusairis ; rather he mixes them with various other sects of Islām that sprang along with the Shī'a sect⁴. He identifies the Nusairis with the *Malāhida* (heretics), the *Qarāmiṭa* (Karmatians)⁵, the *Baṭiniyya* (people of the esoterism)⁶ the *Ismā'īliyya*, the *Khurramiyya*⁷ and the *Muhammira*⁸.

The Nusairis, says Ibn Taimiyya, outwardly professed to be the followers of Islam but inwardly led an anti-Islamic movement, and for some time they became masters of a considerable part of Syria. It was through the assistance of these Nusairis that the Mongols¹ entered the city of Baghdād and put an end to the Abbaside

(1) *Majmū 'Rasā'il* (Cairo 1323) pp. 94-102.

(2) d. 728/1328. For his biography see my article 'Ibn Taimiyya and His Anthropomorphism' in the Dacca University Journal, Vol. X, 1934, pp. 77-88.

(3) Supra p. annot. 6 & 7.

(4) *Majmū' Rasā'il* l. c., p. 97.

(5) After the name Qarmat, the leader of a faction among the Ismā'ilis, who separated himself from the original faction in 227/848. For the etymology and early history of the word Qarmat see Enc. of Islam s. v. Karmatians by Massignon; *Rasā'il Ikhwan al-Safā*, II, 60-62, 80-91; iv, 182-217 (Bombay 1303).

(6) Besides the outward sense of the Qur'ān they maintain that it contains some inward sense in it. This name has been applied by Arab authors to several distinct sects of Islām. Enc. of Islam I, 679, s.v. Bāṭiniya.

(7) They came into prominence after the execution of Abu Muslim of ḫurasān in 136/753. They believed in transmigration etc. Enc. of Islam II 974 sq, s.v. ḫurramiyya.

(8) Browne. Lit. Hist. of Persia I, 311; Enc. of Islam s.v. Muḥammira.

(1) Ibn Taimiyya like other Arab writers calls them Tartars although in his *Majmū 'Rasā'il* l. c., but they are better known in history as Mongols.

Caliphate in 656/1258. It was Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī², the leader of the sect and the minister of the Mongols at Alamūt³ who instigated the execution of the Caliph⁴ and the massacre of the orthodox Sunnis.

These Nusairis as well as the sects of the Karmatians, continues our author, were the worst enemies of the true Muslims. They did more harm to the Muslims than did the Mongols and the Franks, for they professed themselves, amongst the ignorant Muslims, to be Shi'aites and helpers of the family of the Prophet, whereas they did not believe in God or His Prophet and religion. They gave a false interpretation to the verses of the Qurān and the sayings of the Prophet¹ and claimed to possess a mystical knowledge in connection with the manifestation of the Deity (*lāhūt*) in mankind (*nāsūt*). Their philosophy in this aspect was that God loved human beings and taught them how to recognise Him and worship Him; and that a Nuṣairī could

(2) Naṣīr al-Dīn Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Al-Ḥasan, an astronomer, polyhistor and Shi'a politician of the period of the Mongol invasion, born at Ṭūs in 597/1201, and died at Baghdād in 672/1274. In 654/1256 he played the assassin leader Rukn al-Dīn Khurshāh into the hands of Hulāgū whom he accompanied as his trusted adviser to the conquest of Baghdād. He retained his influential position under Abāka the son of Hulāgū i.e. the second Mongol Ilkan prince of Persia, 1265-1282. Ṭūsī composed the Commentary *Ḥall Mushkilāt al-Ishārāt* (lucknow 1293) on the *Ishārāt wa' l-Tanbīh* of Ibn Sīnā. Here he defended Ibn Sīnā against Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī. On the other hand he wrote against Fakhr al-Dīn's *Muhassal Afkār al-Mutaqaddimīn* the critical commentary *Talkhīs Muḥaṣṣal* (edited at the foot of *Muḥaṣṣal*, Cairo, 1323.) He further wrote *Awṣaf al-Ashraf*, a mystical work in which he gave a clear manifestation of his Shi'a conduct. His *Akhḡlāq-i Nāsirī* is universally known. For further information see Enc. of Islām, IV, 980-982.

(3) A mountain-fortress north-west of Qazwīn, which is famous for its being the seat of the grand-Master of the Assassins from 484/1090 upto 654/1256. This fortress was built in 246/860 by the Alide Ḥasan al-Dā'ī ila'l-Haqq. During the reign of the Ṣafawides it was used by them as a state prison. Its remains may be visible even now. See Huart, *La Fortresse d' Alamut* in the *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris* XV; Enc. of Islam I, 249 sq.s.v. Alamut.

(4) Caliph Musta'ṣim r. 640/1242-656/1258.

(1) See infra p. 9.

not be called a true Nuṣairī with whom they could drink, associate, whom they could entrust with their secrets and to whom they could give their daughters in marriage unless he had been initiated by his teachers. The essence of this initiation was that they made him swear to conceal his faith and the names of his *shaikhs* (spiritual guides). He was moreover forbidden to consult any Muslim or any one who did not belong to his fraternity. He had to believe with an unswerving faith in the *Ism* and *Ma'nā* (name and idea)² throughout the ages from the beginning of the creation to the end of it, taking *Ādam* and *Shīth* to be the first *Ism* and *Ma'nā*, respectively. In order to prove the *Ism* and *Ma'nā* they had recourse to the Qur'ān and said that the Prophet *Ya'qūb* was the *Ism* and *Yūsuf* the *Ma'nā*, because when the sons of the former asked pardon of him for their crime in throwing *Yūsuf* in the well, he uttered, "Presently I will ask pardon for you of my Lord; surely He is the pardoner, the Merciful,"¹ but, because *Yūsuf* was the *Ma'nā* so, unlike his father, when his brothers said, "By Allāh, now Allāh has certainly chosen you over us, and we were certainly sinners,"² he replied, "There shall be no reproof against you this day, Allāh may pardon you, and He is the most merciful of the merciful,"³ and did not depend upon any one, as he knew that he was the absolute authority. They further say that *Mūsā* was the *Ism*, *Yūsha'* the *Ma'nā*, for the sun obeyed the order of *Yūsha'*, the Lord and yielded to him. They also believed that *Sulaimān* was the *Ism* and *Āsaf** the *Ma'nā* because *Sulaimān* was unable to fetch the throne of queen *Bilqīs* and it was *Asaf* who did it by his wonderful power.⁴

(2) For a further explanation of these words see Muḥammad Najm al-Ḡhanī, *Madhāhib al-Islām* p. 170 sq. (Lucknow 1924); Hastings Enc. of Religion and Ethics, IX, 419.

(1) Qur'ān, Sūra XII, 99.

(2) " , " XII, 91.

(3) " , " XII, 92.

(4) There is no mention of this name in the Qur'ān. Baiḍāwī mentions it as *Āsaf* b. Barakhyā (Hebrew *Asaf* b. Berekyah) the minister of *Sulaimān*. See the commentary of Baiḍāwī in Sūra XXVII, 40. Ṭabarī, I, 588 sqq. (de Goeje). Enc. of Islām s.v. Barakhyā. (I, 476).

(5) Majmū' Rasā'il l.c. p. 95.

In brief, the Nuṣairis enumerated the Prophets and the Messengers, one after another, down to the time of the Prophet Muhammad whom they took to be the *Ism* and 'Alī the *Ma'nā*, but the essence of their faith was that 'Alī was their Lord (Rabb), the Prophet Muḥammad the *veil* (Ḥijāb) and Salmān the Persian¹ the *gate* (al-Bāb) and that this would continue upto eternity². The names of the *Khamsa Aitām* (five incomparables)³ and the twelve *mugabā'* (pursuivants)⁴ were written in their scriptures and they manifested themselves, by turns, as the Lord, the *Veil* and the *Gate*. They further believed that Caliph 'Umar was the greatest of all devils, next to whom was Abū Bakr and then 'Uthmān. In addition to their aforesaid mystic knowledge the Nuṣairis believed that the five daily prayers meant five names, namely 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusain, Muḥsin and Fāṭima, and that the utterance of these five names exempted them

اشهد ان لا اله الا
لا حجاب عليه الا
لا طريق اليه الا
حيدرة الانزع البطين
محمد الصادق الامين
سلمان ذر القرة المتين

(1) A renowned *Ṣahābī*, (companion of the Prophet) born with magian faith but later on abandoned it for Christianity and finally for Islām. For his interesting history see Ibn Hishām pp. 136-143. Enc. of Islām, s.v. Salmān al-Fārsī (IV, 116 sq).

(2) On this a certain Nuṣairī composed the following verses in the 7th century A.H. See Majmū 'Rasā'il l. c., p. 95.

(3) They are (I) Miqdād b. Aswad al-Kindī, (II) Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī (III) 'Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa al-Anṣārī, (IV) 'Uthmān b. Maẓ'ūn al-Najāshī, and (V) Oanbar b. Kādān al-Dausī. See the 5th Sūra of their scripture in J.A.O.S., Vol. VIII, 247.

(4) They are (I) Abū Haiṭham Mālik b. al-Taiyihan al-Ashḥalī, (II) Al-Barā' b. Ma'rūr al-Anṣārī, (III) Al-Mundhir b. Lūdān b. Kannās al-Sā'idī, (IV) Rāfi b. Mālik al-'Ajlānī, (V) Al-Aswad b. Ḥusain al-Ashḥalī, (VI) Al-'Abbās b. 'Ubāda al-Anṣārī, (VII) 'Ubāda b. Ṣāmit al-Nawfalī, (VIII) 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar b. Hizām al-Anṣārī, (IX) Sālim b. 'Umair al-Khazrajī, (X) Ubai b. Ka'b, (XI) Rāfi' b. Warāqa and (XII) Bilāl b. Rayyāḥ al-Shanawī. These pursuivants, they say, were chosen by the Prophet Muḥammad from among seventy men on the night of 'Aqaba, in the valley of Minā. Hence they are so important.

from the obligatory washing of *janābat*¹ and ablution (*waḍū'*) as well as from all *shurūṭ* (conditions) and *wājibāt* (duties) of prayer, and that the fasting of thirty days indicated thirty men and thirty women, and that it was 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalīb who created the heavens and the earth and had been an *Imām* (leader) in both the worlds². These Nuṣairīs believed in lawfulness of wine, transmigration of souls and the eternity of the world (*qidam al-ʿĀlam*) and denied resurrection and judgment day, Heaven and Hell³.

The Nusairis composed books against orthodox Islam and shed the blood of the Muslims without any compunction. According to our author who makes no distinction between the Nuṣairīs and the early Karmatians, they killed the Muslim pilgrims to Mecca and cast them into the well Zamzam, on another occasion they took away the black stone (*al-hajar al-aswad*) and kept it with them for a long time⁴. They killed the learned Muslims, their divines and their soldiers. They wrote many books on their creed and the Muslim 'Ulamā replied to them exposing their paganism and heresy⁵.

It was through these Nusairis that the Christians mastered the sea-coast of Syria for, the former were always helping the enemies of the Muslims whoever they might be. So these Nuṣairīs joined the Christians (Franks) against the Muslims, and they considered it a great calamity when the Muslims defeated the Tartārs in 659/1261⁶. These people rejoiced a great deal when the Christians occupied the frontiers of the countries that had always been under the sway of the Muslims along with the island of Cyprus⁷ which had been conquered

(1) For another form of their vile prayer purifying themselves from *Janābat*; see J.A.O.S, VIII, 264.

(2) *Majmū' Rasā'il* l. c., p. 94.

(3) *Ibid*, p. 94.

(4) This is a clear reference to the wars of the Qarmatians.

(5) *Majmū' Rasā'il* l.c.p. 97.

(6) This refers to Hulāgū's attempts in 658/1260 to conquer Syria. Hulāgū himself had to return to Persia whilst his troops were routed by Sulṭān Qutur at 'Ain Jālūt in 659/1261.

(7) An island near the coast of Asia Minor.

by the Muslims during the Caliphate of 'Uthmān and remained in their possession down to the middle of the year 400/1009. The Nusairis who increased in number on the sea-coast and elsewhere, helped the Christians to conquer the sea-coast and the city of Jerusalem etc. though afterwards Nūr al-Dīn Shāhid¹ and the famous Saladin² recovered all these places in the last part of the 12th century A.D. along with Egypt that had been ruled by the Christians for about two hundred years.

Lastly, in criticising the faith of these Nusairis, Ibn Taimiyya expresses his opinion that outwardly they are Rawāfiḍ³ but inwardly they are downright infidels. In fact they believed neither in the foregoing Prophets and the Messengers⁴ nor in any of the Holy Scriptures and their injunctions. Some of them did not believe that the world had a creator or that there would be a judgment day in the next world. They built up their doctrines on critical, philosophical and theosophical investigations: some times they feigned to be philosophers but some times they held the speculation of the fire-worshipping magians and combined these doctrines with Rāfiḍism (extreme Shism) and produced false arguments in support of the same by a saying of the Prophet—*Awwalu mā khalaqa Allāhu l-'aqlu*⁵ (the first thing that Allāh created was intelligence) whereas this is an apocryphal *ḥadīth* according to all authorities. The genuine *ḥadīth* is—*Inna Allāha lammā khalaqa al-'aqla fa-qāla lahu aqbil fa'aqbala, faqāla lahu adbir fa'adbara* (when Allāh created 'reason' ('aql) he said to it, "Approach" and it approached. Then he said to it "Retire" and it retired). But the Nusairis, in accordance with the views of the Aristotelian philosophers altered the wordings of the saying and said, "*Awwalu mā khalaqa Allāhu al-aqlu*."

Such delusive doctrines of these people spread far and wide even amongst the learned and pious Muslims who, though they

(1) Nūr al-Dīn Jangī Ata Beg of Alepho d. 569/1174.

(2) Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf b. 532/1138 d. 569/1193.

(3) Sing. rāfiḍī meaning Shī'ate or heretics.

(4) Like Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad.

(5) For this tradition see Ibn al-Daiba' *Tamrīz al-Tayyib* p. 40, I; 47. Al-Ghazzālī, *Iḥyā*, I, 33. Al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-I'tidāl* II, 332, 5.

did not actually accept the principles of the Nusairian creed, followed some of their doctrines and mentioned them in their philosophical treatises. This sort of interpretations were given by Nusairis mainly to deny the existence of God and ridicule Him. Some of these Nuṣairis proceeded so far as to write the name of *Allāh* in the lower part of their legs. The Prophet Muḥammad and Mūsā, they said, came to establish sovereignty in the world and they did it nicely, whereas, others such as Christ failed to do it and were killed. They ridiculed, as has been already said¹, the five daily prayers, poor rates (*zakāt*), fasting, pilgrimage, and (to their utter moral degradation), they legalised marriages with *dhawāt al-maḥārim* (women within prohibited degrees of marriage).²—

After this short review of the so called religion of the Nusairis one can at once realise that in the opinion of Ibn Taimiyya they follow no particular religion at all; he sums up his opinion in the following sentence :—

“Sometimes they seem to follow the trinity of the Christians and sometimes the extreme views of the Shias while at other times they follow nothing whatsoever.”³

(1) See Supra p. 8.

(2) For *dhawāt al-Maḥārim* see the Qur’ān, Sūra IV, 26-28. They are 14 in number.

(3) It will be worth while to go through an interesting *fatwā* (legal decision) with regard to 14 queries, produced by our author in his *Majmū*, *Rasā’il*, pp. 98-102 edited at Cairo in 1323 A.H.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE IMMIGRATION OF PERSIAN POETS INTO BENGAL.

DR. M. I. BORRAH, M.A. (DAC.), PH.D. (LOND)

Department of Persian and Urdu.

The history of the beginning and growth of the Persian language in India shows that the political supremacy of the Persian speaking people over the length and breadth of the country was one of the chief causes of the culture of their tongue. The adoption of the Persian language by the Turco-Persian rulers of the country as the language of the court and *belles-lettres* necessitated its study by the native population in order to gain a footing in the business of the state and to enjoy other facilities which were open to them; knowledge of Persian in those days was considered as a sign of refinement and culture, just as English is in modern times. With the advent of Muslim rule and the permanent establishment of a Muslim empire, a large number of Persian scholars immigrated to India; and the irruption of the Mongol hordes from central Asia and their destructive and ruthless incursions into Persia in the thirteenth century, compelled many a learned Persian to seek asylum in India. These immigrants and refugees made India their permanent home and formed the nucleus of Indo-Persian culture and scholarship. They brought with them the heritage of a highly gifted race and planted it in the fertile soil of India. That is why India produced eminent poets, historians, divines and mystics, who if not superior, are at least equal to any of the famous poets or historians of contemporary Persia.

Bengal was ruled by the Muslims for over five hundred years (1202-1756 A.D.), and for a considerable period of time it enjoyed complete independence from the sway of the Delhi emperors, till the subjugation of the country by the Mughals

in 1576 A.D., during the reign of the emperor Akbar, when Ḥusain Qulī Khān was appointed the Governor of Bengal. The political history of Muslim Bengal may be divided into three distinct periods: e.g. the early period when Bengal was governed by the Viceroys of the Delhi Sultanate of the Slave dynasty, i.e. from A.H. 594/ A.D. 1198⁽¹⁾—A.H. 739/A.D. 1338; the period of the independent sultans of Bengal, i.e. from A.H. 741/1340 A.D.—A.H. 984/1576 A.D., and thirdly the Mughal rule commencing from A.H. 984/1576 A.D.—1170/1757 A.D. when the government of the country passed into the hands of the English after the defeat of Sirājū'd-Dowla in the battle of Plassey.

The materials for the history of Persian poetry and literature of the pre-Mughal period in Bengal are very meagre. It is surprising to note that Bengal was governed by independent rulers for a period of over two hundred years, but no contemporary detailed accounts of their government, and the state of art and literature have come down to us. A proper search in the province may one day bring out more facts which would add to our present knowledge of these subjects. The only available sources on which we are to depend for our materials are the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* and the *Riyāzu's-Salātīn*.⁽²⁾ But both these books deal, mainly, with the political history of the time rather than literary or social history. They have, however, given us some incidental references as to the part played by some rulers in the encouragement of learning in their domain.

Of the early rulers mention has been made of Muhammad-bin-Bakhtiyār Khaljī and Ghiyāsu'd-Dīn as patrons of learning who built colleges in their capital and granted stipends to

(1) *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 150.

(2) The *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* was written by Minhāju'd-Dīn, a court historian of the court of Nāṣiru'd-Dīn Mahmood and was completed in 1258-9 A.D. The author had conversed with many people who helped in the conquest of Bengal, and he himself stayed several months at Lakhnautī the capital of Bengal. The *Riyāz* is a history of Bengal compiled in 1202 A.H.—1786 A.D. by Ghulam Ḥusain Salim. It is based on earlier sources which were available to the author. But it is defective in dates.

scholars⁽¹⁾. As instances of Ghiyásu'd-Dín's generosity towards men of learning, the author of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Nāṣirí* narrates the following facts: "He granted stipends to scholars, pious men and descendants of the prophet; and other people acquired from his bounty and generosity much riches. For example there was an Imám Zāda of Fírúzkoh named Jalálu'd-Dín son of Jamálu'd-Dín Ghaznaví who migrated to India with his family, and after a few years returned to Fírúzkoh in A.H. 608=1211 A.D. with abundant wealth. People enquired about the means of the acquisition of his wealth. He stated that when he came to India he determined to proceed from Delhi to Lakhnautí. When he reached that capital Almighty God pre-ordained things so that he was called upon to deliver a discourse at the court of Sultan Ghiyásu'd-Dín Khaljí. That sovereign of generous disposition brought forth from his treasury one big tray of gold and silver *tankah*, and about ten thousand silver *tankahs* were awarded over and above these; the officers of the state were commanded to make liberal presents. About three thousand gold and silver *tankahs* more were obtained. At the time of his return about five thousand *tankahs* were received as gifts so that eighteen thousand rupees were amassed by that Imám through the good will of that king of Lakhnautí. When the writer of this history reached that country of Lakhnautí, the good works of that sovereign in different parts of the country were seen by him."⁽²⁾

During the reign of the independent Muslim kings, Bengal attained great prosperity. Two great Royal Houses, one of Ḥájí Ilyás and another of 'Aláu'd-Dín Ḥusain Sháh ruled the country very successfully, and extended their domain as far as Kamrúp or western Assam. They built strong forts, beautiful mosques, colleges, students' Hostels and traveller's rest houses, excavated tanks, and laid down roads for the benefit of the public⁽³⁾. Of these kings, Sultan Ghiyásu'd-Dín and 'Aláu'd-Dín Saiyid Ḥusáin

(1) *Ṭabaqát-i-Nāṣirí*, 151, 161.

(2) *Ṭabaqát* p. 162

(3) *Riyás*, Tr. p. 95, f. n.

Sharif-Makkí commonly known as Ḥusáin Sháh were noted for their patronage of learning. The court of Ghiyásu'd-Dín is said to have been an asylum for the learned and the cultured, and he was himself a just and righteous sovereign, and a man of light and sweetness⁽¹⁾. His invitation of the Persian poet Ḥáfiz to his court amply testifies to his love of learning. An interesting anecdote has been recorded by historians with reference to his invitation to Ḥáfiz. "It has been related that once Sultan Ghiyásu'd-Dín fell seriously ill and being in despair of his life, nominated three of his concubines named, Sarv (cypress), Gul (Rose) and Lála (Tulip), to perform the last bathing ceremony. When God granted him recovery, the Sultan considered them to be auspicious and conferred on them more favour than before. The other concubines became jealous and began to taunt them about the bathing. One day when the Sultan was in a convivial mood they reported this matter to him. The Sultan uttered this hemistich :—

ساقیِ حدیث سرو و گل و لاله می‌رود

"Cupbearer, the story of the Cypress, the Rose and the Tulip is being talked"

The king could not compose the second hemistich, and none of the poets of the court could complete it. Then the Sultan having written the hemistich sent it through an envoy to Ḥáfiz of Shíráz (to supply the second line). Khwāja Ḥáfiz composed the second hemistich *extempore*

این بحث با ثلاثه غشاله می‌رود

"This discourse relates to the three bathers"

This second hemistich is not devoid of ingenious skill. Ḥáfiz also sent a complete Ghazal to the king. These two couplets are from that (poem)."⁽²⁾

(1) Ibid, p. 108, f. n. 3.

(2) Riyáz Text, pp. 105-6 ; and Tr. pp. 108-9. The entire Ghazal is to be found in Diwán-i-Ḥáfiz, Brackhaus edn, No. 158.

شکر شکن شوند همه طوطیان هند * زین قند پارسی که به بنگا له میروند
حافظ ز شوق مجلس سلطان غیاث الدین * خاموش مشو که کار تو از ناله میروند

"All the parrots of India would become the pecker of sugar
From this persian sugar-candy that goes forth to Bengal.
Ḥāfiẓ, from the desire for the Company of Sultan Ghiyāṣu'd-Dīn
Rest not ; for thy work (lyric) is the outcome of lamentation."

The author of the *Riyāz* says that Ḥusāin Shāh had established Mosques and Rest-houses in every district of his kingdom, and he conferred gifts upon saints and recluse for their maintenance. He endowed several villages for the maintenance of the shrine of Shaykh Nuru'l-Quṭb at Pandua⁽¹⁾. Further researches show that he founded a Madrasah in his capital for the advancement of learning. A contemporary inscription has been discovered which bears testimony to the fact of his establishing a college in 907 A.H.=1501 A.D. This inscription begins with the saying of the prophet "Search after knowledge even if it be in China".⁽²⁾

Of the rulers of Bengal under the regime of the dynasty of Shér Shāh, Tāj Khān Karrānī and Sulaimān Karrānī were noted for their learning and love of learned men. Badāonī⁽³⁾ mentions that Tāj Khān Karrānī was the most learned and accomplished of the Afghān rulers. The same historian remarks in another place about Sulaimān Karrānī's love of saints and scholars thus :—"Akbar heard that Sulaimān Karrānī, Governor of Bengal used every night to offer prayers in the company of hundred and fifty renowned Shaykhs and 'Ulemās and used to remain in their society till morning listening to commentaries and exhortations ; after morning prayers would occupy himself in state business and the affairs of the army and of his subjects".⁽⁴⁾ These facts disclose that these rulers had provided sufficient facilities for the promotion of learning in their domain. But on account of the paucity of detailed accounts

(1) *Riyāz* p. 135.

(2) J. A. S. B., 1874, p. 303.

(3) P. 409, Vol. I.

(4) Badāonī, p. 200 Vol. II.

we are not in a position to make a fair estimate of the nature of literature produced during their rule.

When we come to the Mughal period we find a little better account of Persian language in Bengal than in the previous reigns. There are contemporary and later chroniclers and biographers who have mentioned the names of men of learning at the court of the Mughal governors. Of these rulers, Qásim Khán, Islám Khán Mashhadí, Sháh Shujá', Mír Jumla, Sháyesta Khán, Ibráhím Khán son of 'Alí Mardán Khán, and 'AlíVardí Khán have been mentioned by different chroniclers as being patrons of learning. They encouraged Persian poetry and offered asylum to many poets who came to Bengal during their regime. Mír Jumla who came of a noble family of Ispahán was an accomplished scholar. He was himself a poet and is said to have left a Kulliyát containing twenty thousand verses. The author of the *Tazkira-i-Naṣrábádí*¹ says that he saw this Kulliyát with his own eyes. He has also cited some of his verses as specimens of Mír Jumla's poetry.

Having sketched above a brief outline of the causes of the migration of Iranian scholars into Bengal and the nature of patronage they received at the court of the rulers, we shall now attempt to present an account of the poets who flourished in the country during the Mughal period. The detailed study of the life and works of these poets would require further research ; the materials and space at my disposal do not permit me to go beyond that of drawing the attention of modern scholars towards this neglected side of the subject. I hope that a serious enquiry will be undertaken in Bengal as well as outside which may lead to the discovery of more facts which would give us a complete account of the state of Persian literature in the Eastern part of the Mughal Empire.

SARMADÍ'

His full name is Muḥammad Sharíf Isfahání. He migrated from Isfahán to India during the reign of Akbar. He was favourably

(1) P. 71.

received by the Emperor and raised to the *Manṣab* of two hundred.¹ *Badāoní*² says that he was at first 'Chowkinavis', and then was deputed to Bengal with *Mír Sharíf Amúli*.³ According to *Akbar Námah*⁴ he served in the 31st year of Akbar's reign in Kashmír, and in the 32nd in Gujarát. In 1000 A.H./1591 A.D., he was sent to Bengal with *Sharíf Amúli*. So it seems that he lived at least for four years in Bengal. He died in the Deccan in 1015 A.H.⁵ The exact place of his death is not known.

He is considered to be one of the learned men of the reign of Akbar, possessing the gift of composing excellent verses and a sound knowledge of Arithmetic.⁶ Before he came to the court of Akbar he used to write under the pen-name of *Faiẓí*. But when he met *Faiẓí*, the poet Laureate of the Emperor, he changed the name from *Faiẓí* to *Sarmadí*, so that he might please the vanity of *Faiẓí* who wielded great influence at the court.⁷

JA'FAR BEG

Ja'far son of *Mírzá Badi'uzzamán Qazwiní*:—His full name was *Mírzá Qiámu'd-Dín Ja'far Beg*. He adopted *Ja'far* as his *Takhallus*. He had immigrated to India in the 22nd year of Akbar's reign⁸, i.e. in 985/1577. He was introduced to the Emperor by his uncle *Mírzá Ghiyásu'd-Dín Aṣaf 'Alí Khán* who was in the service of the Emperor at that time. *Ja'far* was favourably received by Akbar who conferred upon him the *Manṣab* of twenty and attached him

(1) 'Ain. Tr., p. 516 ; Text P. 164.

(2) Vol. II., P. 335.

(3) *Sharíf Amúli* was a staunch follower of Akbar's *Dín-i-Ilahí* and his apostle for Bengal ; *Badāoní* calls him a frivolous and a detestable heretic. For details of his life see *Badāoní* Vol. II, p. 245 ; *Tuzuk*, p. 22 ; 'Ain., Tr. pp. 452, 607.

(4) Vol. III, Lucknow edn. p. 629.

(5) *Nashtar-i-Ishq* p. 524, *Dághistání* says, he died in the Deccan.

(6) 'Ain, Tr. I. p. 607 ; Text. p. 181.

(7) *Nashtar-i-Ishq* 524 ; *Badāoní*, II., p. 335.

(8) 'Ain, Tr. I., 411.

to the Dákhilis of his uncle.¹ This rank was considered by Ja'far as a mark of insult rather than honour; so he gave up visiting the court. When this matter was reported to the Emperor he was ordered to go to Bengal² to the court of Khán Jahán, the Governor of the province. During those days compelling a man to come over to Bengal was considered a great punishment as it was commonly believed that the unhealthy climate of the province was sufficient to kill a person of the western countries, and very few could survive the effects of the enervating climate. An interesting anecdote has been related of his meeting with Mauláná Qásim Káhlí³ at Akbarabad before he left for Bengal. When they met, the Mauláná enquired who he was and where he was going. Ja'far explained the situation and said that he was ordered by the Emperor to go to Bengal. At this the Mauláná said "You are a comely youth. It is a pity that you are to go to Bengal". He replied "I have no choice; I am going there depending on the will of God. Whatever is destined will be fulfilled". The Mauláná then remarked "Beware! Do not rely on God. It is the same God who has made the most darling ones of the prophet to be martyrs in the field of Kárbalá."⁴ When Ja'far Beg reached Bengal, Khán Jahán was ill and died a few days afterwards.⁵ This fact gives us an approximate date of his arrival in Bengal. Khán Jahán died in the end of the year 886 A.H.—1578 A.D. So we can reasonably conclude that Ja'far-Beg came to Bengal some time towards the end of 1578 A.D. Khán Jahán was succeeded by Muẓaffar Khán in the Viceroyalty of Bengal. During the latter's rule the Afghán chiefs rebelled and put Muẓaffar Khán to death.⁶ At the time of this mutiny when

(1) Ibid; Nashtar-i-'Ishq, p. 245, is evidently wrong when it says that he was given the Mansab of forty. Dakhili is a contingent of infantry. They are also called Nima Sawāran or half troopers. 'Ain. Tr. I., 254.

(2) Nashtar-i-'Ishq, p. 246; Badáoni III, 216.

(3) Káhlí was a scholar of Akbar's time. He was a free thinker and a disciple of the Emperor. Vide 'Ain., Tr. I. p. 566, Text p. 172, and Badáoni, III. p. 172.

(4) Nashtar-i-'Ishq p. 246.

(5) Ibid p. 246.

(6) For detailed history of this rebellion see Badáoni, Vol. II., pp. 280-81.

many of the nobles went over to the enemy's side, Ja'far Beg remained loyal to the Emperor and after the murder of Muẓaffar Kha'n he fled from Tandah to Fatehpúr Sikri. The Emperor received him very favourably and appointed him to the post of Bakhshī or Pay-master-General with the title of Asaf Kha'n. During the reign of Jahāngír also he held responsible positions and was raised to the rank of five thousand.¹ He died at Burhānpúr in 1021 A.H.=1612 A.D. at the age of sixty-three,² during the reign of Jahāngír when he was deputed in one of the expeditions to the Deccan.

He is said to be an accomplished scholar possessing great intelligence and lofty ideas.³ He was an able writer in prose and verse. He is the author of a Maṣnaví called "Shírín and Khusrau" written after the style of Nizāmí. Ms. copies of this Maṣnaví are available in several of the important oriental Libraries.⁴ Verses from this book have been profusely quoted in Nashtar-i-'Ishq, 'Aín-Akbarí and other Tazkiras.

SALÍM

His full name is Mírzá Muḥammad Qulí Tihrání. Salím is his poetical name. He was a man of Turkish descent and migrated to India from his native land during the reign of the Emperor Sháh-Jahán. In his early life he was at the court of Mírza 'Abdu'llah the Vizier of Lahiján, where he was married and a child was born to him. On his arrival in India he wrote a Qaṣída in honour of the Emperor with the purpose of becoming one of the court poets. But owing to the jealousy of Abú Tálíb Kalím, the poet laureate of the Emperor, he failed to get a favourable reception at the court. Being disappointed, he gave up the idea of becoming a court poet and then became a 'nadim' or boon companion of 'Abdu's Salám Mashhadí known as Islám-Kha'n who ruled in Bengal

(1) Tuzuk, p. 109.

(2) Nashtar-i-'Ishq, p. 247 ; Tuzuk p. 108.

(3) 'Ain. Tr. I, p. 572 ; Text, p. 173.

(4) Catalogue of Bankipore, No. 274 ; Rieu Vol. I, p. 118.

from 1047-49 A.H.=1637-39 A.D. He died in 1057 A.H.=1647 A.D. at Kashmír and was buried there.¹ According to Naṣṛabādī he died in 1052 A.H.

He has left a Dīwān consisting of different kinds of poetry, and a Maṣnavi called 'Qazá-wa-qadr' (Determination and free will). Ḥusain Qulí Khán the author of the Nashtar-i-'Ishq² says that his Maṣnaví was very popular and obtained the same rank as that of Nal-Daman of Faizí. Copies of this Maṣnaví are available. A Ms. copy of his Qaṣída is in the possession of Ḥakím Ḥabíbur-Raḥman of Dacca. While he was at Láhján he composed a Maṣnavi describing the beauty of Láhján. When he came to India this Maṣnaví was re-written describing the beauties of Kashmír.³

WÁLAH HARWÍ

His name is Mulla Darwísh. He was a pupil of Maulána Fasihí Anṣarí. He came to Bengal by the sea-route from Persia during the reign of Sháh Jahán. He lived and died in Bengal.⁴ The exact date of his immigration to Bengal or the place where he settled is not exactly known. The Nashtar-i-'Ishq⁵ says that when Mírzá 'Abdu'l-Qádir Bídíl travelled in the Šubah of Bang, (Bengal), he enjoyed the company of Darwísh Wálah and was much benefited by this meeting. Mírza Bídíl stayed in Bengal during the viceroyalty of prince Md. 'Aẓam, second son of Aurangzáb (1678-80). This fact shows that the poet had settled in some part of Eastern Bengal, probably at Dacca which was then the capital of the province and centre of culture.

(To be continued)

-
- (1) Nashtar-i-'Ishq, pp. 505-6.
 - (2) P. 506.
 - (3) Naṣṛabādī, p. 297.
 - (4) Nigāristān-i-Sukhan, p. 39.
 - (5) P. 1206.

JAGANNĀTHA'S TREATMENT OF THE GUṆA- CONCEPT IN SANSKRIT POETICS.

(BY PRAKASCHANDRA LAHIRI, KAVYATĪRTHA, M.A.)

Jagannātha has never been explicit upon the point as to what position exactly he assigns to the Guṇas in his theory of Poetry, but he has left his views to be inferred by the student of the Śāstra from a study of his treatment, which is, as we shall see later on, mostly an attempt at harmonising the teachings of the old school with those of the new. Jagannātha's treatment of the Guṇas proper, as well as of the structures favourable and detrimental to them, extends over a considerable length (*Rasa-gaṅgādhara*, pp. 53-74); and throughout this one would apparently mark in him a tendency towards avoiding the question as to the views of what school of opinion he is really subscribing to. Thus, his remarks at the very beginning of his treatment of the Guṇas (*raseṣu caiteṣu nigaditeṣu mādhyaujaḥ-prasādākhyāns trīn guṇānāhuḥ*, p. 53) would probably lead one to understand that he is adhering to the teachings of the early *Rasa-dhvani* theorists. But shortly, after this when he proceeds to deal with the question of the substrata of the Guṇas, one certainly considers him to be leaning towards the views of the *Riti* school.

Students of Sanskrit Poetics know that the theory of Guṇa as conceived by the authors of the *Dhvanyāloka* was developed further on the same lines by Mammaṭa. His views were accepted with slight or no modification by later writers till the advent of Jagannātha who was the first (and indeed the last) to raise his finger against this unqualified acceptance. While Jagannātha does not totally reject the position of the *Dhvanikāra* that the Guṇas belong to *Rasa*, his main objection against the theory of his predecessors of the *Dhvani* school is that the Guṇas do not belong exclusively to the *Rasas* but that they belong to the word and its sense as well, not

secondarily but primarily,—a view which bears adequate testimony to the influence which the teachings of the school of Vāmana worked upon Jagannātha, (pp. 54-55). Next he proceeds to discuss the twenty Guṇas of Vāmana with the remark *jarattarāstu* (p. 55)..... *ityāhuh* (p. 62) giving his own views here and there ; and immediately after that he criticises these Guṇas exactly after Mammaṭa beginning with *apare tu..... na tāvataḥ svīkurvanti* (p. 62) and ending this criticism with “*atas traya eva guṇā iti mammaṭabhataṭṭādayaḥ*” (p. 64). Lastly, he takes up the question of word-structures (pp. 64-73) in which he displays unmistakable traces of the influence of the Dhvani theorists.

It is interesting to note that Jagannātha has not given any general definition of Guṇa, nor has he accepted the one given by the early Dhvani theorists, but he has presented the characteristics involved in the latter's individual Guṇas in such a way that it appears to constitute somewhat like a general definition¹ in his treatment. The early Dhvani theorists' definition of Guṇa implies that (1) Guṇas are (primarily) the properties of Rasa, (2) they reside invariably in Rasa and as such, (3) they help the manifestation of Rasa ; and the question of the production of some mental conditions through or by the Guṇas comes in their treatment afterwards, as *viśeṣa-lakṣaṇa*, in connection with the individual Guṇas. But Jagannātha has observed the fundamental character, *viz*, the production of one or other mental condition, underlying these individual Guṇas, and appears to have utilised it in connection with the doctrine of Guṇa in general so as to assign a definite independent character to that

1. Jagannātha's remarks in this connection are interesting though not explicit : “*evaṁ tarhi drutyādi-cittavṛtti-prayojakatvaṁ prayojakatā-sambandhena drutyādikam eva vā mādhyāyādikam astu*”, p. 55. It will be seen that he has not expressly stated “*drutyādi-cittavṛtti-prayojakatvaṁ guṇaḥ*”, and as such his remarks noted above cannot, strictly speaking, be looked upon as a definition of Guṇa. But his very attempt at characterising all the Guṇas together, instead of defining them separately as done by the earlier Dhvani theorists, gives the student sufficient indications to understand that it was his intention to incorporate in the above remarks the fundamental character of the element itself.

element². In other words, he judges the Guṇa fundamentally in terms of the mental condition it produces ; and when this is admitted, the question as to which factor the Guṇa belongs to does not present much difficulty. Jagannātha appears to solve it from a more or less commonsense point of view, even if this is really a matter of individual experience and opinion. If the Guṇa is understood to be an element having the capacity of producing some mental condition, Jagannātha cannot maintain that that capacity is restricted to Rasa alone ; but, on the other hand, he appears to hold that even the external aspects of poetry, namely, the word and its sense and the composition as a whole may equally possess that capacity³. As such he refuses to accept the position of the early Dhvani theorists that one has to

2. This is, in a sense, an advance made upon the treatment of his predecessors whose Guṇa, having no separate existence excepting in Rasa, does not naturally bring a definite idea as to its own character, for when it is remarked that a quality belongs to some known factor (e.g. Rasa here) or is a *dharma* of it, nothing is thereby said so as to give one a clear and definite idea of the quality itself. We should remember in this connection that towards this advancement Jagannātha had not to explore any appreciable new field of thought nor had he any new materials to utilise but he had only to present the selfsame treatment of his predecessors in a different way applying his remarks (noted in fn. 1) as much to the individual Guṇas as to the element itself and these remarks at once satisfy the *sāmānya* as well as the *viśeṣa-lakṣaṇa* of the Guṇa.

3. *Prayojakatvaṃ cādyṣṭādi-vilakṣaṇaṃ śābdārtha-rasa-racana-gatam eva grāhyam* (p. 55). Note *adyṣṭādi-vilakṣaṇam* where under *ādi* Nāgeśa includes *kāla* and possibly *deśa* and such other factors. This appears to imply that even in ordinary life—apart from the sphere of poetry—particular circumstances give rise to mental conditions like *druti* etc. For instance, some people are extremely sentimental by nature and they are easily moved. Similarly, when a man reaches a particular place, he may burst into tears if the place is associated with some sad remembrances. But we are not concerned with the above circumstances. Note also the spirit of harmony with which Jagannātha reads the views not only of the different schools of thought (e.g. Riti school and the Dhvani school) but also of the different writers of the Dhvani-school itself. This spirit is clearly traceable in two cases, firstly, with regard to the question of the factor to which the Guṇa belongs, and secondly, with regard to the relationship between the Guṇas and the mental conditions with which they are associated. We know that Mammaṭa (*Kāvya-prakāśa*, *kārikās*

take recourse to *upacāra* (secondary or extended use) when one says that the Guṇa belongs to *śabda* and its *artha* or is a *dharma* of them⁴. It will appear, therefore, that Jagannātha lays no mean emphasis upon the structural beauty of composition : and this will also be justified by his very elaborate treatment with copious illustrations, of structures specially favourable to particular Guṇas (*tat-tad-guṇa-vyañjana-kṣamā nirmītiḥ* p. 65), as well as of the defects which are

90-93, pp. 474-76 ed, Jhalkikar) takes the Guṇa to be the cause of the *citta-vṛtti* while Viśvanātha (*Sāhitya-darpaṇa, vṛtti* on *karikā* 606, p. 511. ed Jivānanda) who is anticipated by Abhinava identifies the Guṇa with the *citta-vṛtti*. Jagannātha generally accepts the position of Mammaṭa when he conceives of the relationship of *prayojya* and *prayojaka* between the *citta-vṛtti* and the Guṇas (p. 54) but his difference from Mammaṭa appears to lie in the fact that while in the latter's opinion Guṇa produces the *citta-vṛtti* only on account of the Rasa in which it always resides, the Guṇa according to the former can produce the *citta-vṛtti* even on its own account i.e. quite independently of the Rasa in which it does not invariably reside. The spirit of harmony is also patent from Jagannātha's remarks later on (quoted in fn. 1) where he first takes the Guṇa to possess the capacity of producing the *citta-vṛtti* and then identifies the one with the other. Now, when the Guṇa is *cittavṛtti-prayojaka* it may reside in *śabda*, *artha* and *racanā*; and this is explained by the fact that the reader's mind undergoes the process of melting, expansion etc. on the perusal of the composition as a whole or of the word and its sense. Thus *śabda*, *artha* and *racanā*, which are some external factors responsible for the the production of particular mental conditions of the reader are said to be *cittavṛtti-prayojaka*; or *°prayojya-katva* may be said to reside in them. But, when the Guṇa is identified when the *citta-vṛtti*, it must reside only in the Rasa because a *citta-vṛtti* cannot reside in *śabda* or in *artha* or in *racanā* (and Jagannātha fights shy even to take recourse to *upacāra*). And contrarily, when the Guṇa resides in Rasa, it is not possible to conceive of the relationship of *prayojya* and *prayojaka* between the *citta-vṛtti* and the Guṇa, because both merge their individuality in that state of aesthetic bliss and consequently one has to be identified with the other. The production of the *drutī* and the apprehension of the aesthetic bliss take place simultaneously. So it is that the Guṇa is generally *cittavṛtti-prayojaka*, but in the case of Rasa it is *citta-vṛtīr eva*; for here the relationship of cause and effect disappears. This will also be justified by the fact that the Rasa has been classified as *asamlakṣya-krama-vyañgya*.

4. *tathā ca śabdārthayor api mādhyūyāder idṛśasya sattuād upacāro naiva kalpya iti tu mādṛśāḥ*. p. 55, 11. 9-10.

detrimental to structural beauty. These extend over a great length (pp. 64-74) in Jagannātha's treatment but it is not necessary for us to study them in detail in this connection.

From what has been said above it will not be difficult to ascertain Jagannātha's attitude towards the question of the relationship between the Rasa and the Guṇa. Naturally, he cannot regard the Guṇa to be the inherent property of the Rasa alone (*rasa-mātra-dharma*). But his arguments in support of this position are interesting, not only because they are mixed up with his knowledge of philosophical technicalities but also because they appear to afford a fine example of what Dr. De calls his "subtle reasoning" and his "tendency towards controversy...combined with an aptitude for hairsplitting refinement" (*Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 318). He holds that the theory of early writers of the Dhvani school that the Guṇa is *rasa-dharma* can be proved neither by *perception* (p. 54. 11. 12. 14) nor by *inference*. In the first place, he remarks that unlike *uṣṇa-sparśa*, which is the *anala-dharma*, the Guṇa, which is the so-called *rasa-dharma*, cannot be perceived independently of *druti* etc., the *rasa-kūrya*. Speaking plainly, it stands thus: it is quite possible for us to feel the heat of the fire (*anala-dharma*) even when it does not actually burn us. But the Guṇa is not capable of being perceived independently because its existence is, according to Dhvani theorists, inseparably mixed up with the particular mental condition which the reader undergoes in the process of the realisation of Rasa. On the other hand, if it is assumed that the Rasa, along with the Guṇa, produces *druti* etc. as its effect, and argued on that strength that the Guṇa is to be inferred as the determinant of the causality in Rasa (*kāraṇatāva-cchedakatayā*⁵), Jagannātha would reply by saying that when the Rasa can, by itself, produce the particular mental condition, it is superfluous to admit the existence of another element, *viz.*, Guṇa,

5. This refers to the theory in Vaiśeṣika philosophy that a thing cannot be regarded as a cause unless it is associated with a number of conditions which must exist in the cause in order that it might produce the effect. In the present case it resolves into the position that the Rasa can produce the *druti* because of the Guṇa which exists in it as its *Kāraṇatā*.

in it⁶. Next, Jagannātha argues that the Guṇa cannot be regarded as the property (*guṇa* or *dharma*) of Rasa (the *ātman* of poetry), because the *ātman* is, according to the Vedāntin's conception without any attribute⁷. Nor can the Guṇa be attributed to the permanent moods like *rati* etc., because these, being some limiting conditions (*upādhi*) of the Rasas, are to be looked upon as their *differentia*, and as such further attributes cannot be associated with them⁸. It will appear, therefore, that Jagannātha's intention was to treat the Guṇas as absolute entities and in this respect he may be said to be a follower of Bharata and Bhāmaha. But his own characterisation of the Rasa along with *śabda*, *artha* etc. as one of the substrata of the Guṇas (=the capacity for producing the mental conditions) leaves at least some scope for considering his Guṇa to be a property of the Rasa. The Dhvanikāra's use of expressions like "*śṛṅgāro madhuraḥ*" (D. K. ii, 8) is, according to Jagannātha, analogous with the ordinary use of an expression *vājigandhā uṣṇā*, where *uṣṇatva* is not the exclusive but accidental quality of *vājigandhā*⁹, since it may reside as much in *vājigandhā* as in other articles like onion, musk and wine.

It ought to be noted that although the Guṇa (like any other poetic element) does not find any express mention in Jagannātha's definition of poetry (*ramaṇīyārtha-pratipādakaḥ śabdah*, p. 4¹⁰)

6. *tādṛśa-guṇa-viśiṣṭa-rasānām drutyādi-kāraṇatvād kāraṇatāvacchedakatayā guṇānām anumānam iti cet, (na), prāṭisvikarūpeṇaiva rasānām kāraṇatopapattau guṇakalpane gauravāt* (p. 54).

7. *paramātmā guṇa-śūnya eveti māyā-vādinō manyante, Jhalkikar, Nyāyakoṣa* (1928) p. 473.

8. *kiṁ cātmano nirguṇatayātma-rūpa-rasa-guṇatvaṁ mādhyādīnām anupapannam. evaṁ tadupādhi-ratyādi-guṇatvam api. mānābhāvāt, para-rītyā guṇe guṇāntarasyānaucityāc ca.* p. 55.

9. The *Vājigandhā* (*withania somnifera*) is an Indian plant which is famous specially for its stimulating character.

10. *lakṣaṇe guṇālaṁkāṛādi-niveśo'pi na yuktaḥ. uditam maṇḍalam vidhoḥ iti kāvye.....gato'stam arkaḥ ityādau cāvyaṅgyāpatteḥ* (p. 6). These two specific instances are, he holds, charming by reason of their suggested sense, although they contain neither Guṇa nor Alankāra. Thus, he appears to support his position on the ground that the practice of mentioning a particular poetic

his broad conception of this element is quite in harmony with the definition and to some extent helps us to understand the propriety of his classification of poetry. Dr. De has already noted¹¹ the wide scope of Jagannātha's definition of poetry, namely, that the *ramaṇīyatā* involved therein includes in its comprehensiveness all the orthodox poetic elements. In the case of Guṇas, the mental conditions evoked account for the poetic charm (*ramaṇīyatā*) and their presence raises even *śabda*, *artha* and *vacanā* (not to speak of *Rasa*) to the standard of the reader's appreciation. This adequately justifies the fact that Jagannātha, like Kuntaka, does not look upon the presence of *Rasa* as the only test of a poem's appeal to the reader.¹² In his opinion *ramaṇīyatā*, which is taken to be the *sine qua non* of true poetry, is due to the presence not only of *Rasa* but also of one or more of other factors, namely, *vastu* and *alaṃkāra-dhvani*, *vācyālaṃkāra* etc. The contribution of his Guṇas in this connection is also not insignificant. His classification

element in the definition of poetry is defective since it excludes the scope of other poetic elements. Two courses are then open. Either all the elements that can afford poetic charm should be explicitly embodied in the definition of poetry, or it must be defined in terms of some such factor as may be regarded as the essence of all of them. It may, therefore, be generally held that Jagannātha thinks his definition to be an improvement upon that of his predecessors of the Dhvani school (not excluding Mammaṭa) in the sense that these latter could not effectively utilise a factor like Jagannātha's *ramaṇīyatā* (or their *cārutva*, *camatkāra*, *vicchitti* etc.) which stands like a symbol for all the orthodox poetic elements. Nāgeśa appears to be correct when he remarks : *evaṃ ca viśeṣa-lakṣaṇe teṣāṃ (guṇālaṃkāradīnāṃ) niveśe'pi sāmānya-lakṣaṇe teṣāṃ na niveśa iti na ko'pi doṣaḥ* (p. 7, *Rasa-gaṅgādhara*).

11. *Sanskrit Poetics*, vol. ii, p. 319, where the term *ramaṇīyatā* and its scope (specially with reference to *Rasa*) have been explained. The different heads of classification have also been explained on pp. 320-21 of the same book.

12. *yat-tu rasavad eva kāvyam iti sūhityadarpaṇe nirṇītam, tan na, vastvalaṃkāra-pradhānānāṃ kāvyānāṃ akāvyaṭvāpatteḥ na ceṣṭāpattiḥ. mahākavi-saṃpradāyasyākulībhāva-prasaṅgāt.....* (p. 7, 11.9-11) Jagannātha's main objection against Viśvanātha's definition of poetry is that the latter in his attempt at perfection by directly referring to *Rasa* in his definition considerably narrows down the scope thereof. (See *Sanskrit Poetics* Vol. ii, pp. 283-84 for Jagannātha's objections against Viśvanātha in detail).

of poetry into four different classes namely (1) *uttamottama* (2) *uttama*, (3) *madhyama* and (4) *adhama* (p. 9) also bears testimony to the above fact. These heads of classification will show that the presence or otherwise of *Rasa* serves only to effect a gradation in the degree of charmingness; nevertheless, he admits of the existence of some sort of poetic charm in all of them. His later discussion about word-structures specially favourable to particular *Guṇas*¹³ with copious illustrations in all possible detail tends to show that the scope of his *Guṇas* is scarcely limited and that he views poetic charm as belonging to a wide range of linguistic composition.¹⁴

We shall now briefly discuss Jagannātha's reading of the *Guṇas* of Vāmana under two sections according as they belong to *śabda* or to *artha*, and note the discrepancies between the two theorists in their respective treatment of these *Guṇas*. We have

13. *madhura-raseṣu ye viśeṣato varjanīyā anupadaṁ vakṣyante ta evaujasviṣvanukūlāḥ, ye cānukūlatyoktās te pratikūlā iti sāmānyato nirṇayaḥ* (p.69). Thus the structure which is detrimental to one *Guṇa* (Mādhurya) is favourable to another (Ojas) and *vice versa*. Hence the presence of one or the other *Guṇa* can be felt in any of the two types of composition. And as for *Prasāda*, it has hardly any restriction, quick apprehension of the sense being its essential character. Jagannātha himself has remarked (p. 54) *prasādas tu sarveṣu raseṣu sarvāsu racanāsu ca sādharāṇaḥ*. In a word, the very fact that Jagannātha has admitted the presence of *Guṇa* in and also outside *Rasa* has theoretically enlarged the scope of this element and consequently of poetic charm itself.

14. We must emphasise here that this is again a matter of individual appreciation. In any case, it should be admitted that poems which are *sarasa* do not produce the same amount of poetic charm as those which have in them, according to Jagannātha, *Guṇas* independently of *Rasa*, Jagannātha would naturally say that the degree of the mental condition produced makes all this difference. Even in the case of *Rasa*, Jagannātha has referred (p. 53) to a controversy among two classes of theorists over the question whether a greater degree of *druti* is produced in the order viz., Sambhoga, Karuṇa, Vipralambha and Śānta, or in the order viz., Sambhoga, Karuṇa, Śānta and Vipralambha. Such a controversy is absolutely unprofitable, and Jagannātha himself has appealed to the experience of the connoisseur for a decision over the matter *yadi saḥyadayānām anubhavo'sti sākṣi tadā sa pramāṇam.*)

already^{14a} studied Vāmana's Guṇas, but for the sake of convenience we shall here arrange the readings of both in a tabular form :—

I. Śabdaguṇas.

<i>Vāmana</i>	<i>Jagannātha</i>
(1) Śleṣa :— <i>masṛṇatva</i>	<i>śabdānām bhinnānām-apy-ekatva-pratibhāna-prayojakaḥ saṁhitayaika-jāṭīya-varṇa-vinyāso gāḍhatvā-paraparyāyaḥ</i> (p. 56)

Jagannātha's *śabdānām bhinnānām-apyekatva-pratibhāna-prayojaka* is equivalent to Vāmana's *vṛtti yasmin sati bahūnyapi padānyekavad bhāsante*. The formation of many words into a single whole is the character of the Guṇa in both. But while according to Vāmana this is due to *masṛṇatva* or ease of pronunciation, Jagannātha thinks this to be due to the presence of many words compounded together, in which alliteration (*ekajāṭīya-varṇa-vinyāsa*) plays a prominent part. The *gāḍhatva* is also the character of Vāmana's Ojas. Jagannātha is inclined to approximate his Śleṣa to Daṇḍin's, as will appear from his citation of Daṇḍin's definition of śliṣṭa (= *aspaṣṭa-śaithilya*), but we ought not to ignore one important fact that Daṇḍin's Śleṣa involves no compound words which one sees in Jagannātha's.

(2) Prasāda :— <i>śaithilya</i> (<i>guṇaḥ saṁplavāt</i>)	<i>gāḍhatva-śaithilyābhyām vyutkramaṇa miśraṇam bandhasya</i> (ibid).
---------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

The *vyutkrama* literally means "inversion". Jagannātha uses it in the sense of admixture or "alternate appearance", as his *vṛtti* on the illustrative verse shows.¹⁵ Both these theorists mean the same thing by this Guṇa, but Jagannātha states his point more clearly.

14a. *IHQ*. Vol. IX, no. 4., pp. 835-853.

15. The verse runs thus :—

kiṁ brūmas tava vīratām raṇam amī yasmin dharākhaṇḍala-kṛīḍā-khaṇḍalīta-bhru-ṣoṇa-nayane dormaṇḍalaṁ daśyaii etc. atra yasminnityantaṁ śaithilyam, bhrū-śabdāntaṁ gāḍhatvam, punar nayanetyantaṁ prathamam ityādi bodhyam (p. 56).

*Vāmana**Jagannātha*

- (3) Samatā :—*mārgābheda* *upakramād āsamāpte rītyabhedaḥ*¹⁶
(ibid)

- (4) Mādhurya :—*prthak-padatva* *saṁyoga-para-hrasvātirikta-
varṇa-ghaṭitātve sati prthak-
padatvam* (ibid)

Jagannātha urges the necessity for the absense of conjunct consonants. Nāgeśa remarks on *prthak-padatva* : *padāni bhinnānyapekṣitāni, na tu śleṣavat*. He apparently insists upon the absense of compound words which has also been explicitly demanded in Vāmana's *vṛtti*.¹⁷

- (5) Sukumārata :—*ajaraṭhatva* *aparusa-varṇa-ghaṭitātva* (p. 57)
(= *apāruṣya*)

- (6) Arthavyakti :—*artha-vyakti-hetutva* *jhagiti-pratīyamānārthān-
vayakatva* (quick apprehension of the connection of ideas.....(ibid)

Nāgeśa understands this quick apprehension to be due to the fact that the composition is complete in itself. One has not to depend upon any extrinsic matter in order to understand the sense (*ākāṅkṣādisakala-kāraṇa-sāmagrī-sattvād iti bhāvah*). Vāmana, however, does not make it clear what this explicitness of the sense is due to.

16. It ought to be noted that Jagannātha has not treated of the Ritis separately. But reference to *upanāgarikā* in the *vṛtti* (*upanāgarikayāvopākrama-samāhārau*) as well as Nāgeśa's commentary on the definition of this Guṇa (*rītyaś copanāgarikā paruṣā komalā ca, eta eva krameṇa vaidarbhī-gauḍī-pāñcālyā ucyante*.....p. 56). leaves no room for doubt that Jagannātha holds the same view as Mammaṭa, who follows Udbhaṭa in his conception of the *Vṛtis*.

17. *saṁāsa-dairghya-nivṛttiparam caitat* (Vāmana's *vṛtti* on iii, 1, 20).

Vāmana

Jagannātha

- (7) Udāratā :—*vikāṭatva* (*yasmin sati kaṭhina-varṇa-ghaṭanā-rūpa-nṛtyantīva padāni*) *vikāṭatva-lakṣaṇā* (Expansion in the form of an arrangement of harsh syllables¹⁸.....ibid).

18. Jagannātha does not accept that the *vikāṭatva* involved here is due to a swing of words (*padānām nṛtyatprāyatvam*) as enjoined by Vāmana. He appears to hold that Mammaṭa could not have included the earlier theorists' Udāratā under his Ojas, had he understood this *vikāṭatva* to be due to a peculiar swing of words; for, the verse *sva-carāṇa-vinivṛṣṭair nūpurair nartakīnām* etc. (which Vāmana selected as an illustration of his Udāratā (śābdī) but which has been wrongly ascribed by Jagannātha to the commentators of the *Kāvyaaprakāśa*) is in Jagannātha's opinion, hardly favourable to the structure of Mammaṭa's Ojas. On the other hand, it contains, in his opinion, Mādhurya in some of its parts. Now, it is probable that Mammaṭa included Vāmana's *Vikāṭatā* under his *uddhatatgumpā* without taking into account Vāmana's illustrative verse. But if he included Vāmana's *nṛtyatprāyatva* under his Ojas without being satisfied that the verse in question was favourable to the structure thereof, Mammaṭa himself was to blame, and not his commentators. Further, Jagannātha does not think that the verse in question contains a swing of words at all. This is of course a matter of opinion, and even the last two feet (specially the last foot of his own illustration of Udāratā viz, *haṭhoddhata-jaṭodbhāṭo galapaṭo naṭo nṛtyati*) may in a sense be also said to contain a swing of words. His modification of Vāmana's treatment with regard to the definition of three *śabda guṇas*, viz., Śleṣa, Samādhi and Prasāda simplifies and to some extent strengthens the weak position of Vāmana, but it must be said that he has sadly betrayed himself in his treatment of Vāmana's (*śabda*) Udāratā where he mysteriously ascribes Vāmana's views to the commentators of KP. This admits of no doubt that he had not before him Vāmana's work, but he gathered the latter's views from some second-hand source. The manner of his ascription of the definition of Viśeṣokti to Vāmana does not militate against the view put forward here; for, he might have taken this from Śrīdhara's commentary on *Kāvyaaprakāśa-viveka* where Vāmana's definition of Viśeṣokti has been criticised. (A. S. B. Manuscript of the K. P. Viveka, fol. 194b). In this connection, another fact should also be taken into account. Jagannātha has nowhere mentioned the name of Vāmana or of Daṇḍin with reference to the older theorists' (*jarattarāḥ*) treatment of Guṇas, and he appears to have confused the treatment of these two theorists when he speaks of the two-fold aspect of each of the Guṇas, and at the same time enumerates them by quoting

Vāmana

Jagannātha

(8) Ojas :—*gāḍhabandhatva**saṁyoga-para-hrasva-prācurya-
rūpa-gāḍhatva* (p. 58).

The use of the expression *saṁyogapara-hrasva-prācurya* (abundance of vowels followed by conjunct consonants) raises a doubt whether Jagannātha takes *gāḍhatva* here to mean *sānurāgatva* after Abhinavagupta¹⁹. In fact, the *gāḍhatva* as referred to here and that explained in connection with Śleṣa do not appear to be much different. Even *saṁyogapara-hrasva-prācurya* does exist in the illustration of Jagannātha's Śleṣa. It seems, that the character of these two Guṇas have not been clearly kept apart by Jagannātha.

(9) Kānti :—*aujvalya*
(bandhasya)*avidagdha-vaidikādi-prayoga-yogyānām
puḍānām parihāreṇa prayujyamāneṣu
padeṣu lokottara-śobhā-rūpam aujval-
yam* (ibid)

Jagannātha's definition is merely an elucidation of Vāmana's *sūtra* and *Vṛtti*

(10) Samādhi :—*āroha-varoha-krama* *bandha-gāḍhatva-śītilatvayoḥ
kramenāvasthānam* (ibid)

Jagannātha appears to take *āroha* and *avaroha* as synonymous respectively with *gāḍhatva* and *śītilatva*, a position not on a par with that of Vāmana who takes *āroha* and *avaroha* to be particular aspects (*tīvrāvasthā*) of Ojas (*gāḍhatva*) and Prasāda (*śītilatva*) respectively and not identical with them. He distinguishes Samādhi from Prasāda on the ground that while in the latter *gāḍhatva* and *śītilatva* appear alternately more than once (*vyutkrama*), in the former both appear only once, one being toned down or heightened by another.²⁰

the well known verse *śleṣaḥ Prasādaḥ* etc. of Daṇḍin (Kāvyādarśa I, 41) to whom, however, such an idea of the two-fold aspect of a Guṇa did not occur so clearly.

19. The Guṇa-Doctrine in Bharata. IHQ. Vol. VI, no. 2, p. 357.

20. *krama eva hi tayoḥ prasādād asya bhedaḥ, tatra hi tayoḥ vyutkramena vṛtteḥ* (p. 58).

II. Artha-guṇas.

Vāmana

Jagannātha

- (1) Śleṣa :—*ghaṭanā* *kriyā-paramparāyā vidagdha-ceṣṭitasya*
tad-asphuṭatvasya tad-upapādaka-yukteś
ca sāmānyādhikarāṇya-rūpaḥ saṁsargaḥ
 (p. 59)

Jagannātha's definition would mean "identical association of an artful demeanour—its incongruity (lit. indistinctness) as well as a well-reasoned combination by means of a series of actions." Nāgeśa rightly reads *kriyā-paramparayā* instead of *paramparāyāḥ*. He refers to the too-well-known verse *ḍṛṣṭvaikāsana-saṁsthite priyatame* etc. (quoted in Vāmana, Abhinava and Bhoja) as an illustration. Vāmana's *ghaṭanā* we have already explained.^{20A} Jagannātha has probably given this definition purposely, in order that it might fit in with the sense of the verse in question.

- (2) Prasāda :—*artha-vaimalya yāvad-arthaka-padatva-rūpam artha*
(prayojaka-mātra-vaimalyam (p. 59).
pada-parigraha)
- (3) Samatā :—*avaiṣamya prakramābhāṅgenārthaghaṭanātmakam*
 =(prakramābheda) *avaiṣamyam (ibid)²¹*
- (4) Mādhurya :—*ukti-vaicitrya ekasyā evokteḥ punaḥ kathanāt-*
makam ukti-vaicitryam (ibid).

Gopendra Tripurahara, in his commentary on Vāmana (*vṛtti*, p. 92, Vāṇī-vilāsa Press edn.) takes this *ukti-vaicitrya* to mean *varṇyamā-nasyārthasya pratikarṣe pratipādye bhāṅgyantarenoktiḥ*.....

20A. *IHQ* Vol. IX, no 4, pp. 844-45.

21. It should be carefully noted that Jagannātha's illustrative verse

hariḥ pītā harir mātā harir bhrātā hariḥ suhṛt |
harim sarvatra paśyāmi harer anyan na bhāti me |

is an example more of a *śabda-guṇa* than of an *artha-guṇa*. In Vāmana's illustrative verse, however, which deals with *ṛtu-sandhi* and which we have already discussed in its proper place, the Guṇa may rightly be said to belong to *artha*.

Jagannātha, following Mammaṭa, remarks in his *vṛtti* that but for this strikingness of utterance there would appear a fault²² called *anavikṛtatva* which the Pre-dhvani theorists call *ekārthatva* (useless repetition of the same expression). This *bhaṅgyantara-kathana* would not only keep the poem free from the fault mentioned above but also add a definite charm to it.

Vāmana

Jagannātha

(5) Sukumārā :—*apāruṣya*

*akāṇḍe śoka-dāyitrābhāva-rūpam
apāruṣyam* (p. 60).

Jagannātha (as also Gopendra Tripurahara in his commentary) considers the *Aślilatā*-doṣa to be a negation of this Guṇa. It may be noted that the *amaṅgala* variety of *Aślilatā*-doṣa specifically constitutes the corresponding fault.

(6) Arthavyakti :—*vastu-svabhāva* *vastuno varṇanīyasāsādhārāṇa-
-sphuṭatva* *kriyā-rūpayor varṇanam* (ibid)

As before, Jagannātha follows Mammaṭa and states explicitly in his *vṛtti* that this Guṇa comes under the *Svabhāvokti* *Alamkāra* of the new school.

22. Jagannātha has not dealt separately with the concept of Doṣa except incidentally in connection with the Guṇas ; but he has given, after Ānanda-vardhana, a comprehensive treatment of the mutual contradiction of the Rasas (pp. 56-63). He has named two technical faults *anavikṛtatva* and *aślilatā* here in connection with his discussion of Vāmana's Guṇas, and these appear as opposites of the Artha-guṇas Mādhurya and Sukumārātā. Next, all sorts of faults that arise in connection with word-structure have been included by him under a single technical name *aśraṇya* (*evam ime sarve' pyaśraṇyabhedāḥ kāvya-sāmānye varjanīyāḥ* p. 69). Besides this, he has also referred to some other faults which are to be particularly discarded (*viśeṣato varjanīyāḥ*) inasmuch as they deal with structures which prove to be particularly detrimental to the realisation of Rasa. It will not be profitable for us to discuss these defects of structure in all their detail. We would do well only to remember that Jagannātha has generally followed his predecessors in the Post-dhvani school in his treatment of this section. It cannot be said with any amount of certainty whether the unfinished nature of Jagannātha's work was to any extent responsible for his omission of a separate treatment of the concept of Doṣa. His incidental reference to the Doṣa in connection with Guṇa and Rasa and his elaborate treatment of

Vāmana

Jagannātha

(7) Udāratā :—*agrāmyatva**grāmyārtha-parihāra*

(8) Ojas :—*arthasya prauḍhiḥ* (its five varieties have been already noted)^{22A} *ekasya padārthasya bahubhiḥ padair abhidhānam* (ibid)

bahūnām caikena, tathaikasya vākyārthasya bahubhir vākyaḥ bahu-vākyārthasyaikavākyenābhidhānam, viśeṣaṇānām sābhiprāyatvaṁ ceti pañcavidham ojaḥ, (ibid).

Jagannātha explains *sābhiprāyatva* as *prkṛtārtha-poṣakatā* which is later on taken (after Mammaṭa) to be a negation of the fault *apūṣṭārtha* (use of unnecessary epithets).

(9) Kānti :—*dīptarasatva**dīptarasatva* (p. 62)(10) Samādhi :—*arthadṛṣṭi*

avarṇita-pūrvo'yam arthaḥ pūrva-varṇitacchāyo veti kaver ālocanam (ibid)

It is needless to mention that Jagannātha's Definition is nothing but an elucidation of the two kinds of *artha* mentioned by Vāmana. Jagannātha, later on (p. 63), remarks in the name of Mammaṭa that the poet's consideration (*kaver ālocanam*) about the *artha*, being absolutely necessary in his production, need not be regarded as a separate Guṇa ; otherwise the poet's genius too would have to be regarded as such²³.

Rasa-virodha (pp. 46-53) prior to it make it probable that, like Ānanda-vardhana, Jagannātha did not think it necessary to treat the Doṣas very elaborately but considered the Rasa-doṣa (roughly *anaucitya*) to be the main factor disturbing the poetic effect.

22 A. *IHQ*, Vol. IX, p. 842.

23. *saṁādhis tu kavigataḥ kāvyasya kāraṇam, na tu guṇaḥ pratibhāyā api kāvyaguṇatvāpattiḥ*. We have seen that Mammaṭa does not criticise the Guṇa exactly in this way, but it must be said that Jagannātha's criticism is quite an interesting and pertinent one.

Similarly, Jagannātha criticizes all the above Guṇas of Vāmana under the name and after the manner of Mammaṭa, ultimately admitting, like all Dhvani theorists, the existence of only three Guṇas on the basis of the mental conditions. It will be mere repetition to study here this criticism in detail, but we may present in a tabular form that all the above twenty Guṇas can, according to the new theorists, be ultimately resolved into three, including some under one of these and some under Rasadhvani or the Alāmkāras, and characterising others as mere *doṣābhāvas* or even positive *doṣas*. The *uktivaicitrya* need not be treated as a separate Guṇa since there may be innumerable varieties of strikingness in different poems according to the power of the poet.

GUṆAS.....INCLUDED UNDER.....OR TREATED AS.....

	New Guṇa	Rasadhvani or Alāmkāra.	Vaicitrya- mātra no Guṇa.	Mere Negation of the Doṣa.	Posi- tive Doṣa.
1. ŚLEṢA					
i. śabda	ojo- vyañjaka- ghaṭanā
ii. artha	vaicitrya- mātra
2. PRASĀDA					
i. śabda	prasāda- vyañjaka- ghaṭanā
ii. artha	adhika- padatva	...
3. SAMATĀ					
i. śabda	sometimes a veritable doṣa
ii. artha	vaiṣamya- doṣa	...

4. MĀDHURYA

i. śabda	mādhurya- vyañjaka- ghaṭanā
ii. artha	anavikṛtatva	...

5. SŪKUMĀRATĀ

i. śabda	kaṣṭatva	...
ii. artha	amaṅgala- rūpāślila	...

6. ARTHA-VYAKTI

i. śabda	Prasāda
ii. artha	...	svabhāvokti

7. UDĀRATĀ

i. śabda	ojo- vyañjaka- ghaṭanā
ii. artha	grāmyatva	...

8. OJAS

i. śabda	ojo- vyañjaka- ghaṭanā
ii. artha	vaicitrya- mātra	apuṣṭārtha	...

9. KĀNTI

i. śabda	grāmyatva	...
ii. artha	...	Rasadhvani etc.

10. SAMĀDHI

i. śabda	ojo- vyañjaka- ghaṭanā
ii. artha	kāvyakāraṇa

From all that has been said above it will be easily seen that the most important and original contribution of Jagannātha, so far as the concept of Guṇa is concerned, lies in his discussion about the substrata of this element. Otherwise he has accepted the teachings of the Dhvani theorists only with slight modification here and there. In spite of all his attempts to conceal his own views under the garb of reference to the teachings of the different theorists, one can clearly mark in him a leaning towards the position taken by his predecessors, *viz.* those of the Dhvani school. Thus, he has accepted the definition and character of individual Guṇas of the Dhvani theorists, but treated them in a different way to strengthen his own position. He has also adhered to the number and nomenclature of the mental conditions and has judged the Guṇas on the basis thereof. Then again, the Guṇa, in his theory, comes in the course of his treatment of the Rasas and that portion of chapter I which deals with the Guṇas and their structures ends with the remark : *iti saṃkṣepeṇa nirūpītā rasāḥ* (p. 74). This proves that, in spite of his widening the scope of the Guṇas, Jagannātha was unconsciously dragged into the position of the early Dhvani theorists in presenting the Guṇa as a subsidiary element. And lastly, his description of the letters (*varṇa*), composition (*racanā*) and structures (*nirmīti*) or (*gumpḥa*) as the suggestors (*vyāñjaka*) of particular Guṇas²⁴ shows another clear instance of Mammāṭa's influence upon him. In the treatment of Mammāṭa, whose Guṇa resides in *śabda* and *artha* only secondarily²⁵, the relationship of *vyāṅgya* and *vyāñjaka* between the Guṇa on the one hand and the *śabda*, *racanā*²⁶ etc., on the other is quite justified ; but in the case of Jagannātha who is an adherent

24.*vargasthānāṃ pañcānāṃ apyaviśeṣeṇa mādḥurya-vyāñjakatām āhuḥ* (p. 64) *bhagavadḍhyānaulsukasya.....śānta eva paryavasānāt tad-gata-mādḥuryasyābhivyāñjikā racaneyam* (p. 64) *ta-tad-guṇa-vyāñjana-kṣamāyā nirmiteḥ paricayāya... varjanīyaṃ.....nirūpyate* (p. 66)

25. *mādḥuryaṃ tu pareṣāṃ [vāmanādīnāṃ prācīnānāṃ] asmad [mammāṭabhaṭṭādy] abhyupagata-mādḥurya-vyāñjakam eva. evaṃ ca sarvatra vyāñjake vyāṅgyaśabda-prayogo bhāṭīyaḥ* (p. 62).

26. *Proktāḥ śabda-guṇāḥ ca ye varṇāḥ samāso racanā teṣāṃ vyāñjakatām itāḥ* (Kāvyaaprakāśa, Kārikā 98, p. 484).

of the theory of the Guṇa as a primary virtue of the *śabda*, such a procedure is absolutely unwarrantable. This, together with the more important position of Jagannātha regarding the question of the substrata of the Guṇas may be explained by the fact that he was trying to effect a synthesis of the views of the old school and those of the new by borrowing materials from both. This was to a great extent responsible for the curious combination and apparent contradiction.

But the real importance of Jagannātha's work does not lie in his treatment of the concept of Guṇa alone. It is true that he has generally been an adherent to the main teachings of the Dhvani theorists, but in spite of that, a careful observer would not fail to see that he displays a spirit of sturdy independence throughout his work. Thus, some of the well-established views of eminent theorists of the Dhvani school he dismisses unceremoniously as incapable of standing criticism; and even those that he accepts had to pass through the crucible of his strong scrutiny. He has a peculiar way of reproducing things in a forceful language, on account of which even long-accepted views appear to be newly set forth by him. This is traceable not only in his treatment of the Guṇas but also of the Alāmkāras which constitute the greater portion of the present work (*Rasa-gaṅgādhara*) as well as the whole of his *Cītramīmāṃsā-khaṇḍana*.

Jagannātha tells us that he received his training at the feet of his father Perubhaṭṭa, who became a master of all the different branches of Hindu Philosophy²⁷. Jagannātha imbibed from him the spirit of an intensive scholarship, and quite naturally his knowledge of philosophical technicalities has crept in even in his works on Alāmkāra. His involved language and his line of argument bear proofs of an inevitable influence of his deep study specially of Nyāya and Vedānta systems of Philosophy. But he appears to deviate from the traditional treatment of the Śāstra when he brings in the technicalities of Philosophy to establish his thesis. Thus, he argues, that the *ātman* being *nirguṇa* (without any attribute), Guṇas

27. *Rasa-gaṅgādhara* i, 3; *Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. I, p. 276 and P. V. Kane. (History of Alāmkāra Literature in his Introduction to the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, p. CXXXIII).

like Mādhurya etc., should not be attached to it, and that these Guṇas cannot even be properties of the *sathāyi-bhāvas* like *rati* which themselves serve as the differentiating characteristics of particular Rasas. For, in the first place, we must not forget that the propounders of the Rasa theory never understood the realisation of Rasa to be identical with the philosophical contemplation of Brahman but only analogous with it (*brahmāsvāda-sahodara*), and as such they must have considered the *ātman* of Kāvya to be distinct from the object of the Vedāntin's realisation. And, in the second place, the Dhvani theorists' treatment has left no scope for such a criticism, since the Guṇa, which, in their theory, represents the mental condition involved in the realisation of Rasa, has got nothing to do with the permanent mood (like *rati* etc.) unless and until this latter is raised to a state of relish through certain co-operation of the *vibhāvas* etc. Jagannātha completely overlooked the Dhvani theorists' analogy between the Kāvya and the human being. Otherwise he would not have missed their analogy between the Rasa possessing the Guṇas as its properties and the human soul possessing human virtues. And so far as the Rasa is concerned what appeared to be inconsistent in the eye of a Naiyāyika would not have been so from the view point of an Ālankārika, to whom the enjoyment of the aesthetic bliss is beyond ordinary canons of inconsistency and irregularity (cf. *alaṅkāra-siddher bhūṣaṇam etat, na dūṣaṇam*). The study of Nyāya Philosophy sometimes tends to make the scholars concerned careless about broad facts and mindful about minute details. Jagannāth probably could not—as he could hardly be expected to—prove any exception.

But whatever objection might be raised against Jagannātha's twisting of language, his subtle distinctions and his habit of using philosophical technicalities in arguing a point, it must be admitted that the ultimate result which he thus arrives at (viz. that the Guṇa is a property of *śabda*, *artha*, *rasa* and *racanā* alike) is valuable since it makes out a strong case for a comprehensive conception of poerty, as he has done. As regards the allegations made against him we should bear in mind that the spirit of the age in which he flourished and the environment in which he was educated were to a great extent responsible for them. We know that Jagannātha

flourished at an age when linguistic precision and logical exposition were accepted as the ideal of scholarship ; and this naturally influenced not only Jagannātha and his work on poetics but all the different branches of Sanskrit learning. He argues like a true logician and expresses his ideas with force and dignity and presents his theory with a great amount of boldness and confidence—a character essentially required of all true scholars and honest thinkers. His manner of argument, in spite of all its defects, undoubtedly indicates what profound amount of thought he bestowed on the subject. And when the theories and principles of Poetics as established by the Dhvani school came to be finally established and widely accepted, casting into the background all earlier speculations, any further development of the Śāstra could, if it was at all to be expected, probably be brought about only by a reactionary of the type of Jagannātha.



ON THE CONSTITUTION OF LIGNIN.

PULIN BEHARI SARKAR.

In spite of the fact that scientific investigation on lignin began nearly a century ago (Payen, *Compt. rend.* 1838, 7, 1052, 1125) and since then, a large number of workers all over the world have engaged themselves to elucidate its nature, the constitution of lignin still remains unknown. The structural formulae advanced uptil now are found to be highly speculative—not a single of them can explain all the experimental facts satisfactorily. We have no definite knowledge as regards the constituent groups present in the lignin molecule and such knowledge is obviously essential to arrive at its structure. Though all the common groups e.g. OH, CHO, OCH₃, CO, COOH, CH₃-CO etc. have been reported to occur in one lignin or another, yet surprisingly enough evidence is not unequivocal on the presence of such a reactive group as CHO.

It has been suggested by some investigators that carbohydrates particularly pentoses, are part and parcel of the lignin molecule, but this has met with much opposition. A good deal of controversy also exists regarding the molecular size of lignin. While Freudenberg *et al* (*Cellulosechemie*. 1931, 12, 263) and more recently Klason (*Ber.* 1934, 67, 302) consider that genuine wood-lignin has a very high molecular weight, Powell and Whittaker (*J.C.S.* 1924, 125, 357), Harries *et al* (*J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1934, 56, 889), Rassow and Wagner (*Cellulosechemie*. 1932, 13, 109) amongst others hold that its mol. wt. lies near about 900.

Then again, there is diversity of opinion as regards its chemical nature; Klason (*Ber.* 1920, 53, 706, 1864), Heuser and Winsvold (*Cellulosechemie*. 1923, 4, 49), Freudenberg (*Ber.* 1929, 62, 1554), Herzog (*Ber.* 1929, 62, 1600), Hägglund (*Svensk Kem. Tidskn.* 1929, 41, 185) along with many others regard lignin as an aromatic substance with side-chains, but Strupp (*Cellulosechemie*. 1924, 5, 6) and others hold that lignin is hydro-aromatic in nature; while a third group of workers (Willstätter and co-worker, *Ber.* 1922, 55, 2637) maintain

that lignin is entirely aliphatic like cellulose and pentosans to which it is said to be structurally related. Then there is the fourth school of thought, represented chiefly by Jonas (*Z. angew. Chem.* 1921, 34, 289, 373) and Marcusson (*ibid.* 1921, 34, 437; 1922, 35, 165; 1923, 36, 42) who contend that lignin is neither aliphatic nor aromatic but is made up of furane nuclei.

It is therefore obvious that our knowledge of lignin chemistry is still rather amorphous and a good deal of clarification requires to be effected before our ideas become crystallised in the form of a definite chemical formula for the molecule. In a series of papers (Parts i-ix) already published by the author in the *Journal of the Indian Chemical Society*, several aspects of this complicated problem have been studied; in the present paper, we shall very briefly discuss the results we have so far obtained with jute-lignin in so far as they throw any light on its constitution.

The process of lignification being in all probability a continuous one, jute-lignin is expected to be much simpler in composition than wood-lignin as it exists in living plants not more than 5 months in all. This has been inferred from the facts that lignin from jute has a much lighter colour, being pale rosy, while wood-lignin is dark gray; it is dissolved by ClO_2 practically without leaving any residue; while in the case of wood-lignin it is not so. Thirdly, it is acted upon by fused potash at a much lower temperature (200°) than wood-lignin, and lastly, the amount of HCHO obtained from jute-lignin is appreciably higher than from wood-lignin, (as will be shown later on) showing that it has a lower mol. wt. than the latter. Jute is free from nitrogenous matter and has but little ash-content, these cannot therefore contaminate the lignin obtained from jute. For the above mentioned reasons, jute-lignin is an ideal sample to start with.

By a comparative study of the different methods of isolation, it has been shown by the author (*J. Indian Chem. Soc.* 1931, 7, 397) that HCl -method is the best. By a modification of this method, a sample of lignin has been obtained from jute, which is not substantially different from the natural product as regards its colour, the absence of acetyl group, the presence of iodoform- and carbon dioxide-yielding complexes, its methoxyl-content, absence of furfuraldehyde-yielding component etc.

CARBOHYDRATES AS CONSTITUENT
PART OF LIGNIN :

The fact that Willstätter-lignin from spruce wood gave arabinose when boiled with 3% HCl, led Hägglund (Ber. 1923, 56, 1866) to propound the hypothesis that pentosans or furfuraldehyde-yielding bodies are part and parcel of the lignin molecule. According to Schmidt (Ber. 1925, 58, 1394) lignin is a compound of an aromatic body with not only pentosans but also hexosans. During delignification by ClO_2 , these sugars are removed along with 'lignin'.

HCl-lignin from jute prepared in the usual way gave traces of furfural (aniline-acetate test), on distillation with 12% HCl, but lignin prepared and purified according to the modified method of the author gave no trace of it. Jute-lignin prepared by the HCl-method is a spongy mass and as such it tenaciously retains a fraction of the sugars by absorption, which can only be removed by prolonged boiling with water under reflux for 2-3 days. This fact shows that pectin or hemi-celluloses are no constituent part of lignin. The presence of furfural-yielding complex in lignin appears to be due either to incomplete hydrolysis of the plant material or to imperfect purification of the lignin even if the hydrolysis be complete.

Secondly, when due allowance is made for the insoluble phloroglucide of HCHO (split off from the $\text{O}-\text{CH}_2-\text{O}$ group), the discrepancy between the furfural values of raw and delignified jute practically disappears, showing thereby that lignin should give no furfural on acid distillation, and none is actually found. The ultra-violet absorption spectra of lignin and its derivatives by Herzog and Hillmer (Ber. 1927, 60, 365; 1931, 64, 1288) indicate that lignin is composed of benzene rings with side-chains of 3 carbon atoms, which are saturated. It is therefore in disagreement with Schmidt's view regarding the composition of lignin. No sugar has yet been detected in the degradation products of lignin to justify the hypothesis that carbohydrates are component parts of lignin, which therefore must be discarded.

BASIC COMPOSITION OF LIGNIN :

From a careful study of the literature on lignin it would appear that all lignins have the same basic composition. Before any definite formula can be assigned to lignin, it is essentially necessary to establish the identity of the basic structure of different lignins. That jute-lignin does not differ fundamentally from various other lignins will be evident from the following :—

(a) By potash fusion, jute-lignin gave the same decomposition products as with other lignins *viz.* oxalic and butyric acids, pyrocatechol, protocatechuic acid and the so-called lignic acid.

(b) By the action of nitric acid, oxalic acid and a nitro-product of indefinite composition were obtained from jute-lignin as from wood-lignins.

(c) By chlorination, a yellow chloro-compound is obtained from all lignins, the percentage of Cl however somewhat varied perhaps owing to the difference in the experimental procedure. It is a case of substitution rather than addition in all cases. The mol. wt. of chloro-lignin from jute as determined by the author was very approximately the same as found by Waentig (*Z. angew. Chem.* 1928, 41, 977, 1001).

(d) As regards the constituent groups, OCH_3 , OH , $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ etc, they are all found in every sample. Double bond and acetyl group seem to be absent, and the iodoform-and carbon dioxide-yielding complexes are present in jute-lignin as also in other lignins.

AROMATIC NATURE OF LIGNIN :

There is considerable difference of opinion amongst workers on lignin as to whether it is aliphatic, aromatic or heterocyclic. An overwhelming majority of experimental evidences show that lignin contains the benzene nucleus. Apart from the results of chemical examination of lignin, we have in our support the physical data from the study of ultra-violet absorption spectra which

indicate a benzenoid structure for lignin. With jute-lignin the following evidences have been obtained :—

(a) By potash fusion of jute-lignin, protocatechuic acid (maximum yield 13.87%) and pyrocatechol (3.84%) were found as the decomposition products. Delignified jute under the circumstances gave no aromatic products.

(b) When HCHO is split off from jute-lignin, the resulting products dissolve completely in dilute caustic alkalis, though the original lignin is insoluble in them. This indicates that free phenolic groups have been formed and that the $\text{O}-\text{CH}_2-\text{O}$ is linked to the benzene ring. The dark colour of the residue left also indicates its di-phenolic character.

(c) The reducing action of jute-lignin has been found to be due to the loss of HCHO from the $\text{O}-\text{CH}_2-\text{O}$ group and consequent appearance of two OH groups in the ortho-position, just as in the case of pyrocatechol. Two adjacent OH groups attached to an aliphatic compound do not behave like this. Moreover, the reducing property disappears on methylation, acetylation and methylenation of the residue left after all the HCHO has been expelled from lignin.

(d) It has been found that substituents like Cl, Br, and NO_2 , in the ring make the phenols comparatively more stable towards ClO_2 . Since chloro-, bromo- and nitro-lignins behave in a similar manner, it may be inferred that these substituents, at least in part, enter the benzene ring when lignin is chlorinated, brominated or nitrated. The fact that lignin and its derivatives are very susceptible to the action of ClO_2 also indicates its aromatic nature.

(e) During numerous estimations of OCH_3 according to Zeisel's method, it has been observed that in the case of jute-lignin CH_3I always first appeared at $92^\circ-93^\circ$. In the cases of vanillin and vanillic acid as well the same phenomenon was noticed. This striking similarity lends support to the view that vanillin residue is present in lignin, or in any case, OCH_3 is linked to the benzene ring.

(f) The amount of oxalic acid (38.1%) obtained from jute-lignin by oxidation with nitric acid, does not support the sugar

structure, in view of the fact that protocatechuic acid and pyrocatechol (which are present in lignin) as well gave oxalic acid under such circumstances as observed by the author.

(g) Jute-lignin gave no furfural or its derivatives, nor any levulinic acid (obtainable from hexoses) on distillation with mineral acids.

(h) Delignified jute (which is practically all carbohydrate) gave no aromatic product on potash fusion.

(i) No sugar—pentose or hexose—could be detected in any of the decomposition products of jute-lignin.

DI-OXY-METHYLENE GROUP IN LIGNIN :

The controversy regarding the presence of this group in lignin is a recent one. It is highly important to decide this question before assigning any definite structure to lignin as in no constitutional formula so far advanced, except that by Freudenberg (*Cellulosechemie* 1931, 12, 263) there is provision for this group. The following facts will prove its presence :—

(a) Formaldehyde has been obtained from lignins prepared from five ligno-celluloses viz. jute, bamboo, rice-straw, cocoanut fibre and teak wood, by distilling with 12% HCl. The $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group from which in all probability it comes, is thus a common constituent of lignin.

(b) The presence of $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group in lignin and consequent appearance of two adjacent phenolic OH groups by acid treatment (when HCHO is partially or wholly split off) adequately explains the reducing property of ordinary lignin and also of the residue left when pure lignin (which does not reduce) is distilled with acids. Also, the fact that this residue loses its reducing property on methylation or acetylation, can thus be accounted for.

(c) The difference between the furfural values (as phloroglucide) between raw and delignified jute, bamboo, and cocoanut fibre can be properly explained, as HCHO which is split off during pentosan estimation, also gives an insoluble condensation product with phloroglucinol just like furfural.

(d) Purified lignin, which is insoluble in NaOH, is distilled with 28% sulphuric acid until all the HCHO is expelled : the residue has practically the same methoxyl value, showing thereby that no phenolic group has been formed owing to the removal of OCH_3 groups. But the same residue dissolves completely in dilute NaOH, which indicates the existence of phenolic groups. Loss of HCHO from the $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group explains this satisfactorily.

(e) The residue obtained after removing all the HCHO from lignin, has been methylenated with CH_2I_2 and KOH to give a product which again gives practically the same amount of HCHO as the original lignin. This was insoluble in dilute NaOH and no longer reduced Fehling's solution. These facts prove directly and conclusively the presence of the $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group in lignin.

(f) By treating the dry residue left after removing all the HCHO from jute-lignin, with acetone and P_2O_5 at $8^\circ\text{-}10^\circ$, a light coloured product was obtained, which was no more soluble in caustic alkalis and did not reduce Fehling's solution.

THE PRESENCE OF CARBOXYL GROUP IN LIGNIN

It was observed by the author that HCl-lignin from jute gave carbon dioxide on boiling with 12% HCl but no furfural. Purified chloro-lignin behaved similarly. This suggests the presence of a COOH group in lignin possibly with a negative group in the α -position, for it is well known that such organic acids yield CO_2 more or less readily when heated alone or with acids. It is worth while to note that the liberation of CO_2 from such acids is scarcely quantitative. The percentage is higher in the chloro-derivative than in lignin itself. It may be explained on the assumption that some of the Cl atoms enter the side-chain as well and the substitution by the negative element Cl makes the COOH group of the side-chain to part with its CO_2 more easily. Evolution of HCl when chloro-lignin is heated ($135^\circ\text{-}140^\circ$) or loss of HCl by dilute alkali treatment, seems to support the latter view as chlorine in the benzene ring is never removed under such conditions.

Attempts were made to esterify this COOH with dimethyl sulphate and KOH, other methods failing ; but methylated lignin

(OH groups being simultaneously methylated) formed a tarry product which could not be purified without taking recourse to alkali boiling, in which process the ester was completely hydrolysed—the purified product had the same OCH_3 value even after acid boiling or treatment with alcoholic potash.

THE REDUCING ACTION OF LIGNIN

Jute-lignin prepared in the usual way, like lignins from various other sources, has been found to reduce Fehling's solution. This has been explained by assuming an aldehyde group in lignin. Friese (Ber, 1929, 62, 2538) considers it to be due to traces of sugars present in lignin. The author holds that the reducing action of lignin is due to two OH groups attached to the benzene ring in the ortho-position and that no CHO group is present in lignin. The following facts lead to this conclusion :—

(a) Lignin obtained from jute in the ordinary way with 42% HCl reduces Fehling's solution readily. When it is separated at low temperature, the reducing action is much diminished. Again when this is washed with dilute caustic soda until the washings are colourless, the insoluble fraction has no reducing property at all; but the filtrate reduces Fehlin's solution very readily. It has been shown that the lower the yield of HCHO obtainable from jute-lignin, the greater the reducing action. The longer the lignin remains in contact with the strong acids, and the higher the temperature to which it is exposed, the stronger the reducing property in the lignin so isolated.

(b) When all the HCHO is expelled from the lignin by boiling with 28% H_2SO_4 , the residue (R) shows strong reducing property though the original lignin did not reduce Fehling's solution. If this residue is methylenated with CH_2I_2 and KOH the reducing property disappears altogether.

(c) When the residue (R) is exhaustively methylated with dimethyl sulphate and alkali, the product obtained no longer reduces Fehling's solution.

(d) When the residue (R) is acetylated with acetic anhydride and pyridine, to its maximum acetyl content, the product does not reduce ammoniacal solution of silver nitrate.

(e) Ordinary jute-lignin completely freed from adhering sugars by repeated boiling with water under reflux until the filtrate no longer reduced Fehling's solution, reduced Fehling's solution as before, this reducing action being due to two hydroxyl groups in ortho-position formed during isolation of lignin.

THE QUESTION OF DOUBLE BOND

The presence of double bond in lignin is still a matter of dispute. To explain the formation of rather stable ligno-sulphonic acids, Klason (Ber. 1920, 53, 705, 1862, 1864) assumed an ethylene linkage in lignin. Many other investigators are in favour of a double bond in the side-chain though from the study of the absorption spectra Herzog and Hillmer (Ber. 1927, 60, 365, Ber. 1931, 64, 1288) conclude that the side-chains are saturated. Freudenberg and co-workers (Ber. 1929, 62, 1554) consider the bromination of pine-wood lignin as substitution but they appear to have presented no quantitative data.

In the case of jute-lignin this question has been decided by estimating simultaneously the HCl evolved as well as the chlorine entering the lignin molecule. Separated lignin in aqueous suspension as also moist raw jute itself, was treated with chlorine, and the ratio, Cl combined to Cl evolved as HCl was found to be considerably higher—(about 1:3). In carbontetrachloride medium, separated lignin was chlorinated and the ratio was found to be very approximately equal to 1:1. This was independent of time and temperature of chlorination. These results prove that the side-chain in jute-lignin is saturated.

Secondly, in the presence of metallic palladium, jute-lignin absorbed no hydrogen. This would indicate the absence of an ethylenic linkage in jute-lignin.

Thirdly, attempts were made to determine the iodine value of jute-lignin in the usual way with ICl and IBr. There was slight absorption of these reagents but this does not show the presence of a double bond in view of the fact that saturated aromatic compounds like phenol and anisol (but not benzene or benzoic acid) also behaved like lignin.

It is therefore concluded that jute-lignin is a saturated compound.

THE NATURE OF THE ALKYLOXYL GROUPS :

The following facts are worth consideration regarding these groups in jute-lignin :

(a) By absorbing the alkyl iodide (in Zeisel's apparatus for methoxyl determination) in dimethyl aniline, only trimethyl phenyl ammonium iodide was identified, this shows that only methoxyl groups are present in lignin.

(b) On boiling jute-lignin with 28% sulphuric acid or with alcoholic caustic potash under reflux, the methoxyl value remained remarkably unchanged. Thus, all methoxyl groups are linked in the form of ether.

(c) The temperature at which CH_3I was first formed from jute-lignin during methoxyl determination by Zeisel's method, was always found to be $92^\circ\text{--}93^\circ$, at which vanillin or vanillic acid also gave CH_3I ; it is inferred that the methoxyl groups are attached to the benzene ring, possibly as vanillin residue.

(d) During isolation of lignin from jute in the ordinary way by 42% HCl there was a slight loss (1.96%) of methoxyl, but carefully separated jute-lignin contained all the methoxyl groups (19.18%) present in natural lignin.

(e) Assuming the molecular weight of jute-lignin to be 830, (for which there are sufficient grounds) this methoxyl value of 19.18% indicates that there are 5 OCH_3 groups in the lignin molecule.

ACETYL GROUPS IN LIGNIN :

The fact that wood and similar other lignified materials when distilled with mineral acids give acetic acid has caused several investigators to assume that lignin contains acetyl groups. This is still an unsettled fact in as much as no lignin preparation upto now has been found to yield acetic acid under similar conditions. According to Jonas (Papier Fabrikant 1928, 26, 221) acetyl group is split off from lignin by very strong HCl during isolation even in the cold. He therefore includes an acetyl group in his modification of Schrauth's formula for lignin. Heuser (Paper Trade J. 1930, 88, 75) also considers the acetyl group as characteristic of lignin.

To decide if natural jute-lignin at all contains any acetyl group, acetic acid has been estimated in purified raw jute and in jute delignified by ClO_2 , without of course previously boiling with 1% KOH for one hour, which process facilitates delignification. It has been observed that all the acetyl groups present in raw jute are present in the delignified jute. This unmistakably indicates that lignin native in jute contains no acetyl group.

Acetic acid from delignified jute appears in all probability to be due to the pectin matter present in jute. That pectin contains acetyl groups has been pointed out by many investigators (Fuchs, *Die Chemie des Lignins*. 1926. p234). In support of the view that lignin contains no acetyl group, may be mentioned a more recent observation by Ritter and Kurth (*Ind. Eng. Chem.* 1933, 25, 1250) who have just separated lignin leaving all the acetic acid of the original wood in the carbohydrate portion. The view of Pringsheim and Mangus (*Z. physiol. Chem.* 1919, 105, 179) that the whole of the acetic acid in wood is derived from lignin, is not therefore justified. Also their view that the dark colour of lignin is due to the loss of acetyl groups cannot therefore stand.

THE ACTION OF CHLORINE ON LIGNIN :

The chloro-compounds prepared from separated jute-lignin and from jute directly, have been found to be practically identical. When HCl-lignin was chlorinated at 60° for four hours the maximum Cl-content was 17.6%. This was also the case when chlorination was done with catalysts like iodine, ferric chloride or antimony trichloride. When chloro-lignin with a chlorine content of 25.8% of Cl (obtained by chlorination at room temperature) was dissolved in dilute caustic soda and then precipitated with mineral acids, a compound with 17.71% of Cl was obtained. Again, when the same derivative (with 25.8% of Cl) was heated to 135° - 140° until there was no more evolution of HCl, the compound that was left behind had a chlorine content of 17.80%. Lastly, when it was re-chlorinated in glacial acetic acid the percentage of Cl rose up from 25.8 to 32.70. No chloro-compound gave any product of the type of mairougallol and leucogallol as found by Cross and Bevan,

If the mol. wt. of jute-lignin be taken to be 816 the mechanism of chlorination can be satisfactorily explained. Under ordinary conditions, 25.8% of Cl in the chloro-lignin means 8 Cl atoms enter the molecule to give $C_xH_{y-8}O_zCl_8$. On being heated to 135°-140°, or treated with dilute caustic alkalis in the cold, 3 atoms of chlorine are lost as HCl, to leave behind a compound with 5 atoms of Cl in the molecule i.e. $C_xH_{y-11}O_zCl_5$. (with 17.7% of Cl) and during chlorination of lignin at 60° or with catalysts, the same product results. On re-chlorination, the original compound gives a product with 11 atoms of Cl, *viz.* $C_xH_{y-11}O_zCl_{11}$ (with 32.7% of Cl). The methoxyl value as well can be explained similarly. Two methoxyl groups are present in chloro-lignin which means 5.67% of OCH_3 , while actually 5.61% has been found.

This view is supported by the fact that the mol. wt. of chloro-lignin with 25.8% of Cl, has been found to be 1080 in phenol by the cryoscopic method; the theoretical value is 1090. By the boiling point method Waentig (Z. angew. Chem. 1928, 41, 1001) obtained a similar figure for chloro-lignin from straw.

THE NATURE OF THE HYDROXYL GROUPS :

The presence of OH groups in lignin has been definitely established, but opinion seems to be divided as to whether they are all alcoholic, or both alcoholic and phenolic in nature. The behaviour of some organic compounds with one or two free phenolic groups towards ClO_2 has been utilised by Schmidt and co-workers (Ber. 1925, 58, 1394) as an argument for assuming the presence of free phenolic groups in lignin which behaves in a similar manner.

A larger number of phenolic compounds have been studied by the author and it has been found that all of them are readily decomposed by ClO_2 ; but when these phenolic groups are protected either by acetylation or methylation, the resulting products also react with ClO_2 though less readily. Acetylated or methylated lignin behaves similarly. As lignin contains more than one OCH_3 group attached to the benzene ring, it is obvious that the fact that it is acted upon by ClO_2 does not in any way prove the existence of any free aromatic OH in the molecule.

The fact that diazomethane methylates approximately one (0.9) OH in lignin with a mol. wt. of 820, (Freudenberg and Hess, Ann. 1926, 448, 121 ; Fuchs and Horn, Ber. 1929, 62, 1691) cannot prove the existence of free phenolic group in lignin, as diazomethane reacts, although sluggishly, with alcoholic OH groups as well, particularly in high molecular substances like starch and cellulose. Carefully prepared jute-lignin has been found to be insoluble in caustic alkalis—in which it dissolves when the $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group is wholly lost. It therefore appears unlikely that jute-lignin contains any free phenolic group.

Methylation of lignin prepared in the ordinary way cannot give any accurate information as to how many OH groups are present in natural lignin, as new OH groups are always set free unless special precautions are taken, by the partial decomposition of the $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group. As a matter of fact a higher methoxyl value (36.21%) has been obtained by methylating ordinary HCl-lignin, than in the case of pure jute-lignin separated at low temperature and washed with dilute NaOH at room temperature (34.51%). During methylation with dimethyl sulphate and alkali below 26° , the $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group remained in tact.

It has been mentioned above that if 830 be accepted as the mol. wt. of jute-lignin, 19.18% OCH_3 in the pure lignin means 5 OCH_3 groups in the molecule. And 34.51% methoxyl in the fully methylated lignin indicates 10 OCH_3 groups in all, 5 additional OCH_3 have therefore entered into the original lignin.

By acetylation of jute-lignin, similar results have been obtained—a higher amount of acetic acid (31-32%) was found in the acetylated lignin isolated in the usual way, while fully acetylated purified lignin (isolated at low temperature) gave 29.45% of acetic acid. The latter figure only corroborates the conclusions arrived at by methylation of jute-lignin—viz. that 5 OH groups have been acetylated on the assumption that jute-lignin has a mol. wt. of 830.

As free phenolic groups do not appear to be present in lignin, it is obvious that all these 5 OH groups are alcoholic in nature, i. e. they are all in the side-chain. It may be mentioned

here that on boiling the fully methylated product with 28% sulphuric acid or alcoholic caustic potash under reflux, for 3-4 hours, the methoxyl value remained remarkably constant showing thereby their ether linkage.

THE MOLECULAR SIZE OF JUTE-LIGNIN :

Until recently, workers in the field of lignin chemistry were practically unanimous regarding the molecular size of lignin—its mol. wt. was considered to lie near about 800. Experimental data on molecular weight determinations supported this view (Fuchs, *Die Chemie des Lignins*, 1926, p. 178). As a matter of fact, many of the analytical data can be explained on this basis. Freudenberg and Hess (*loc. cit.*) explained the methylation of pine-wood lignin with diazomethane taking 820 as the mol. wt. of lignin. Fuchs and Horn (*loc. cit.*) from their analytical results, on acetylated pine-wood lignin arrived at the value 804. Klason (*Arkiv. Kemi. Geo.* 1927, 6, pt. 15. 7) studied ligno-sulphonic acid from spruce wood and determined the mol. wt. of the original lignin as 714.

Freudenberg seems to be the first to express the opinion later on that lignin has a high molecular weight. (2176). (*cf. Cellulose-chemie* 1931, 12, 263). His conception appears to depend primarily on the small yield of formaldehyde (1.2%) obtained from pine-wood lignin prepared according to his method. Klason too has very recently changed his former views and holds that the mol. wt. of lignin must at least be 3640 (*Ber.* 1934. 67, 302). But save and except these two veteran investigators, the view is generally held that the molecular weight of lignin cannot be higher than 900. (*cf. Brauns and Hibbert, J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1933, 55, 4720 ; *Rassow and Wagner, Cellulosechemie.* 1932, 13, 109).

The method of potash fusion being too drastic, quantitative yield of aromatic products cannot be expected even when the fusion is done under the mildest and the most favourable conditions. Hence, potash fusion data on jute-lignin can furnish no definite information as regards its molecular size. As has already been mentioned, the highest yield of formaldehyde from jute-lignin has been 2.78%. On the assumption that this represents only 77.6%

of theory, (as with piperonylic acid) and also that only one $\text{O}-\text{CH}_2-\text{O}$ group is present in lignin, its molecular weight comes to 830, which is in fair agreement with those obtained by other investigators. In support of the high yield of HCHO from jute-lignin it may be mentioned that very recently Harries *et al* (J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1934, 54, 889) have found 1.6% of HCHO in maple wood lignin; it is not mentioned whether they took all possible precautions to prevent the loss of HCHO during isolation, for they used 72% sulphuric acid, which has been found to destroy much of the dioxymethylene group in the case of jute-lignin.

Secondly, as has been pointed out, the molecular weight of chloro-lignin (with 25.8% of Cl) was found in phenol to be 1080, whence the molecular weight of lignin roughly comes to 816. The mechanism of chlorination has been satisfactorily explained on this basis. This is also in agreement with Waentig's results with straw lignin.

Thirdly, pure jute-lignin has 19.18% OCH_3 , which means 5 methoxyl groups are present in a mol. wt. of 830. On exhaustive methylation, 34.51% was the final methoxyl value reached, which figure shows that 5 additional OCH_3 groups have entered the lignin molecule, or in other words, lignin has 5 OCH_3 and 5 OH groups. This strikingly constant simple ratio of OH to OCH_3 tends to indicate that the mol. wt. of jute-lignin is 830, or very nearly this figure.

Lastly, by acetylation of pure lignin 29.45% acetic acid was obtained from the fully acetylated product. This again shows that 5 acetyl groups have entered the molecule of 830, which figure therefore represents in all probability the real mol. wt. of jute-lignin.

SUMMARY

(i) Jute-lignin appears to be a less complex substance than wood-lignin as it exists for a very short period in the living plant. Its colour, the action of ClO_2 and of fused KOH on it, and its low mol. wt. support this view.

(ii) Carbohydrates—pentosans or hexosans—are no parts of the lignin molecule.

(iii) The jute-lignin that has been investigated represents the natural lignin in most respects—*viz.* OCH_3 , OH , $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ groups, absence of acetyl group, presence of CO_2 - and iodoform-yielding complexes etc.

(iv) The basic composition of jute-lignin is the same as that of other lignins and so it is not essentially different from them.

(v) Jute-lignin is aromatic in nature, and not aliphatic nor structurally related to carbohydrates.

(vi) The dioxymethylene group appears to be a common constituent of lignin. The presence of this group in jute-lignin has been established by removal of this group and re-methylenating it.

(vii) The dark colour of jute-lignin prepared in the usual way seems to be due to two OH groups in the ortho-position set free during the isolation of lignin.

(viii) Jute-lignin appears to contain a COOH group with a negative radical in the α -position.

(ix) Jute-lignin contains no ethylenic double bond.

(x) The alkyloxy groups in jute-lignin are all methoxyl. They are all linked in the form of ether.

(xi) Jute-lignin contains no acetyl group.

(xii) Chloro-lignin from jute parts with 3 atoms of Cl as HCl , when heated to $135^\circ\text{-}140^\circ$. Also, on treating with dilute alkali, 3 Cl atoms are lost as HCl . At 60° or with catalysts, chlorolignin formed has 3 Cl atoms less than under usual circumstances.

(xiii) The mechanism of chlorination can be explained satisfactorily on the assumption that jute-lignin has a mol. wt. of 816, which figure is also obtained from the mol. wt. determination of chloro-lignin in phenol.

(xiv) All the OH groups in lignin are alcoholic in nature, and no free phenolic group seems to be present.

(xv) The mol. wt. of lignin lies near about 830. This figure is reached from the HCHO value, assuming that only one $\text{O-CH}_2\text{-O}$ group is present in lignin.

(xvi) The formation of butyric acid on potash fusion of jute-lignin indicates the presence of a side-chain with 4 carbon atoms.

(xvii) From methylation of lignin as also from acetylation, it is found that jute-lignin has 5 OH groups in a molecule of 830.

(xviii) The methoxyl value of 19.18% in pure lignin shows the presence of 5 OCH₃ groups in natural lignin. The OH, OCH₃ and O-CH₃-O are all in simple ratio if 830 be accepted as the mol. wt. of jute-lignin.

(xix) Jute-lignin gives no mellitic acid on oxidation with nitric acid. The highest yield of oxalic acid is 39.1%, which may at least partially result from the pyrocatechol residue which is present in lignin. Oxidation of methylated lignin with HNO₃ (5N) failed to give any anisic acid.

(xx) Lignin insoluble in alkali becomes soluble as soon as free OH groups are liberated from the dioxymethylene group. This shows the absence of free OH groups in genuine lignin.

(xxi) The action of ClO₂ on lignin cannot be used as an argument for assuming the presence of free phenolic groups in lignin, as acetylated or methylated phenols are also attacked by this reagent.*

* My hearty thanks are due to my teachers Dr. J. K. Chowdhury and Dr. J. C. Ghosh for their kind and sympathetic encouragement for the last six years and also for offering me extraordinary facilities for work in the laboratory.

EDITORIAL NOTES

"The Dacca University Studies" owes its existence to the desire of the University of Dacca to provide a handy and compact medium for the publication of articles embodying researches carried on by its members. At present, they contribute articles to learned magazines and periodicals in India and abroad ; while it is not desirable to discourage this practice altogether, it is felt that the University ought to have a publication of its own which will encourage and co-ordinate research work in the University. The Executive Council of the University has laid down :

"(a) All contributions to *"The Dacca University Studies"* should either contain new facts or new interpretations of old facts, and should have a permanent value. Current controversial topics are to be avoided.

(b) Only contributions by the staff and students of the University should be accepted for publication.

(c) There should be, ordinarily, two issues of the *Studies* during each academic session."

The subjects to which articles belong have been classified in alphabetical order and all articles have been arranged accordingly.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

1. *Allahabad University Studies*

Vol. XI (Arts and Sciences), 1935.

2. *Journal for the University of Bombay*

January, March, May, and July 1935 (Vols. III, Parts IV, V, VI, and Vol. IV, part I).

3. *Journal of the Madras University*

(July, 1935, Vol. VII, No. 2).

4. *The Half Yearly Journal of the Mysore University*

Mysore University, 1933 and 1934 (Vol. VII No. 2).

UNIVERSITY OF DACCA.

Notification.

The following Dacca University Bulletins are offered for sale. All letters and remittances should be addressed to the Registrar, University of Dacca, P. O. Ramna, Dacca.

Bulletin No.	Title of Bulletin with name of author.	Price,
I	Lokayata by Mahamahopadhyaya H. P. Shastri, M. A., C. I. E. -/8/-
II.	A Midsummer Night's Dream by Dr. U. C. Nag, M. A., Ph. D. -/12/-
IV.	Eastern Humanism by Professor Sylvain Levi -/8/-
V.	On the Tests of the Stanford Revision of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Scale by Satyajivan Pal Re. 1/8/-
VI.	Absorption of the Vratyas by Mahamahopadhyaya H. P. Shastri. M. A., C. I. E. -/8/-
IX.	On Two Problems in Shakespeare— Hamlet and Troilus & Cressida by P. K. Guha, M. A. Re. 1/-
X.	Philosophy & History by Professor G. H. Langley, M. A. -/8/-
XI.	The Character of Gawain by Dr. B. K. Ray, M. A., Ph. D. -/6/-

* Bulletin No. III is not available and Bulletins Nos. VII and VIII have not been published.

XII.	The Meaning of Art by Dr. Rabindranath Tagore The Idealistic School in Buddhism by Professor Tucci Meditative and Active India by Professor Formichi	}	.. Rs. 2/-	
XIII.	The Construction of Reading Material for Teaching a Foreign Language by Dr. Michael West, M. A., D. Phil....			... Re. 1/-
XIV.	Word Frequency in Bengali and Its relation to the Teaching of Reading by P. C. Debchaudhury, M. T. Re. 1/-
XV.	The Arab Invasion of India by Professor R. C. Majumdar, M. A., Ph. D. Re. 1/4/-
XVI.	Old English Morphology by Dr. B. K. Ray, M. A., Ph. D. Rs. 2/-	
XVII.	History of the Paramara Dynasty by Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M. A., Ph. D.		... Rs. 10/-	

The following publications of the **Oriental Text Publication Committee** are offered for sale. All letters and remittances should be addressed to the Secretary, Oriental Text Publication Committee, University of Dacca, P. O. Ramna, Dacca.

No	Title of the Publication with the name of author.
----	------------------------------------------------------

1. Kīcakavadha of Nīṭivarman (D. C. pp. I-XXVII+128) a ślesa-yamaka kāvya—composed by an eastern writer belonging to a period anterior to the tenth century A. D.—critically edited from two manuscripts with the commentary of Jānardanasena, and an introduction, notes, appendices etc.,
by Dr. S. K. De, M. A., D. Litt, (Lond.)

1929.....Rs. 4/-

2. Harivaṁśa of Bhavānanda (pp. I-XCII+292) a Bengali poem of great interest composed about 16th century A. D.—edited from several manuscripts with an elaborate introduction, word-index etc.,
by Satischandra Ray, M. A.
1339 B. S.....Rs. 3/-
3. Padyāvālī of Rūpa Goswāmin (D. C. pp. I-CXXXV+296) a disciple of Caitanya of Bengal—an important anthology of vaiṣṇava sanskrit verses (16th century A. D.) edited from 16 manuscripts with an exhaustive introduction on Caitanyaism and Chaitanya movement critical notes, bibliographical notes on authors and appendices.
by Dr. S. K. De, M. A., D. Litt. (Lond.).
1934.....Rs. 7/8/-
4. Ādikānda of the Bengali Rāmāyana of Kṛttivāsa—critically edited from original manuscripts with an introduction, notes etc.,
by Dr. N. K. Bhattasali, M. A., Ph. D.
.....(In the Press).

N. AHMAD,
Registrar.

